# THE Catechiſt Catechized: OR, AN EXAMINATION OF AN *Anabaptiſtical Catechiſm*,

Pretended to be Publiſhed for the Satisfaction and Information of the People of God in *Lancaſhire*, &c.

## ALSO SOME OBSERVATIONS

Both Old and New,

Concerning the pretended Viſibility, Univerſality, Antiquity, Infallibility, Unity and Purity of the preſent *Roman* Church and Religion.

Sent to a Gentleman upon his revolt to Popery, and now publiſhed for the Churches good.

By RICHARD HOLLINVVORTH, *Mancunienſ.*

*LONDON*,

Printed by *F. M.* for *Luke Fawn*, and are to be ſold at his ſhop at the Parrot in *Pauls* Church-yard. 1653.

7

LIBRARY OF UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
NEW YORK.
GIFT FROM
DAVID H. McALPIN.

SIR,

THere *is an* Anabaptiſticall Catechiſm *that walks abroad, lately directed to* Lancaſhire; *when it is of age and can anſwer for it ſelf you ſhal know the name of it; it is but newly brought forth to this County, and therefore not Chriſtned. If you meet with it, it would be a good work to* Lancaſhire *in which you dwel, to the Town of* Mancheſter *the place of your Nativity and Miniſtry, to make ſome Annotations of it; a few ſmooth ſtones out of ſoft* Siloam *hurl'd out of your ſling might lay it dead; a friendly arrow ſhot beyond it, may give warning that there is danger: I would not engage you to the conteſt with this* A. B. C. *but that Error is a ſpringing Leproſie in contagious times: Wormes in children may turn to the Plague: a few vacant hours will ſerve the buſineſs, and ſatisfie the earneſt deſire of*

Sir, Your Brother and fellow-Labourer

in the Work of Chriſt,

*January* 1.
— 52.

*Richard Heyricke.*

*For Mr. Richard Hollinworth,*
*with my Love, Theſe.*

# To all in *Lancaſhire*, that love and ſeek the Lord in all his Soul-filling Ordinances, eſpecially them of the aſſociated Churches about MANCHESTER.

*Dearly Beloved, and longed for, our Joy and Crown*;

YOu ſhall with more praiſe to God, light and ſtability to your ſelves, read the enſuing Treatiſe, if you firſt conſider, and lament, that (for abuſe of Ordinances) Satan, transforming himſelf into an Angel of Light, hath undermined all Ordinances of divine Light and Life: The Lords-Day not moral, publique ſolemn Aſſemblies turned into Houſe-meetings, publique Miniſtry exchanged for private Conferences, publique preaching of the Word common to gifted Brethren with called Miniſters; no prayer but when the Spirit moves, no communion in the Supper, but in Churches newly gathered, and no Baptiſm for Infants. No wonder if religious Ordinances be thus undermined, when the Doctrine of the holy Trinity, the Deity of Jeſus Chriſt, and of the Holy Ghoſt, the divine Authority of the Scriptures, the Obligation of the Decalogue, and other Fundamentals of Faith, Holineſs and Righteouſneſs, are, by the Miniſters of the Prince of Darkneſs, profeſſedly overturned. No wonder that Children are unchurched, when ſo many Churches are unchurched, many of them that have done the former having begun at the latter. They who would not be ſaved by Ordinances, ſhall periſh for want of Ordinances; and they that would not unite themſelves to the Fountain of Life by Faith, ſhall be ſeparated from the ſtreams and conveyances of Life, that they may apparantly wither and dye: only, upon the living in *Jeruſalem*, that by the ſubtilty of deluſion, or power of intereſt, are darkened and benummed, pray and weep, that the Sun of Righteouſneſs may ariſe, with healing in his wings. But the Ordinances being the purchaſe of Chriſts blood, as well as the Church, the gifts

of

of his Princely Government, the Enſigns of his Victory over the Kingdom of Darkneſs, and of his glorious Aſcenſion, he will by his ſoveraign Power maintain; And to that end ſucceſſively enoble the ſpirits of ſome with beams of heavenly light and courage, that they ſhall diſcover the ſtratagems of Oppoſers, and adventure upon their Armies marſhalled againſt them, and triumphantly overcome by his glorious power, redeeming the captived Ordinances of their King unto a juſt and glorious Liberty. This being ſo high a favor from Chriſt, the glory of his Grace and Power, it is moſt thankfully to be accepted, and his Inſtruments to be had in honor, by all that rejoyce in the glory of his Kingdom. His Miniſters he hath deſigned to be the Executors of his laſt Will and Teſtament, to them it belongs by divine appointment, to give out the ſeveral Legacies there bequeathed, and to put in ſuit all them, in the high Court of ſacred Scripture, who ſhall, upon any pretence whatſoever, detain any Legacy bequeathed; and where will their faithfulneſs more appear, then to open their mouth for the dumb, and to ſue for Childrens rights, whil'ſt they are forcibly wronged, and unable to right themſelves? where is greater Truſt, and more ſhining Fidelity? The right of Infants to Baptiſm hath of late been openly impleaded in reference to *Lancaſhire*, and the Bill printed to be publiſhed there in ſpecial, with expectation of the concurrence of the godly; but, bleſſed be God, one of the Lords Executors (in *Mancheſter*, where part-taking was moſt deſired and expected) hath wiſely and faithfully joyned iſſue, and by clear Evidence hath procured a determinate ſentence for the ſetling of their undoubted right upon Infants, to our great comfort, and the honor of the Kingdom of Chriſt, in the Right whereof Infants are rightly baptized. And our hope in the Lord Jeſus is, that the queſtioning of the Right of Infants, and the ſhaking of their title, will have that influence upon all the godly in *Lancaſhire*, eſpecially Parents (peculiarly in *Mancheſter*, and the reſt of the aſſociated Churches) that out of enflamed love to Chriſt, and the Souls of their Children, they will ſo much the more ſettle their Judgments in this Truth, by the conſcionable and diligent uſe of this help, provided by the Lord amongſt them, ſo ſeaſonably in reſpect of danger, and ſo ſuitably, in reſpect of clearneſs, brevity, and charge; that will happily lead to the believing, repenting, and prayerful uſe of this Ordinance, which is the Covenant-way of conveying to their

Children the ſure and ſaving Mercies of the Covenant: ſo ſhall they, and others, who have ſeen the holy Seal ſet on in Infancy, clearly behold, in their holy life, the lively characters of the Spirit of the Covenant, the Image of the Lord Jeſus in their riper years; To their own abundant ſatisfaction, the ſilencing of Adverſaries, the increaſe of the Church myſtical, the encouragement of them that have carefully and painfully pleaded their Right; and above all, the honor of the Lord Jeſus, who in their Infancy opened unto them his Arms and Boſom in his Church, that in an hidden way he might warm them with a ſpiritual Life, to be manifeſted in due time. In this hope we pray for you, and labor amongſt you, that we might preſent Parents and Children in Covenant-obedience and bleſſing, at that great Day. This is the principal Deſire and Soul-travel of

The Lords unworthy Servants,

*March* 10. 1652.

who in reference to Infants do rejoyce in our Miniſtry:

*John Angier.*

*John Hariſon.*

*Nathaneel Rathband.*

*William Meek.*

---

THE

# THE
# Authors Preface to the Chriſtian Reader.

IN theſe times the Lords Builders are compelled while they with one hand work in the work, with the other hand to hold the weapon: Some wiſe Maſter-builders have been valiant for the Doctrine and practiſe of Pædobaptiſm, whileſt others have bent their tongues like a Bow againſt it: Some of them I have ſeen, and made uſe of; ſome I have heard of, not ſeen; others (poſſibly) there are which I have neither ſeen nor heard of. How ever, I deſire that if any wiſdom or ſtrength be diſcerned in this Examination, it may be eſteemed firſt Gods, then theirs; the weakneſs hereof is not theirs (much leſs Gods or the Cauſes) but mine own; yet I humbly hope this poor pains will be acceptable to God, the chiefeſt Maſter-builder and Captain of his Hoaſt, and alſo (thou helping together with thy prayers) profitable to thee his ſervant and Soldier. Satan our grand Enemy would prevail (if he could) for ſuch a groſs renunciation of Baptiſm (received in Infancy) as Witches, Wizzards (his devoted Vaſſals) and open Apoſtates, do make: but having no hope at firſt to prevail ſo far, he endevors to bring us by a pretence of purity to ſuch denyal and renunciation of Infant-Baptiſm as the Anabaptiſts do make, which hath been very advantagious to his Kingdom as well in Germany as in other places; the more ſad it is to ſee that ſome reputed, yea (poſſibly) real Saints, do in the ſimplicity of their hearts act and argue for him in this buſineſs, as Peter did in another, *Mat.* 16. 22, 23.

The various turnings, crooked ways and windings of the Serpent in this Controverſie (as I could in ſo ſhort a time and piece) I have endevored to diſcover, and to make the paths of the Lord ſtraight and plain to his people. Repetitions (for brevity ſake) I have avoyded, even where they might have been ſomewhat uſeful, by reaſon of which ſome parts hereof taken by themſelves may ſeem

*ſeem more* dark *and* defective *then* (*I hope*) *they will be found if thou compare one place with another, and ſpare thy cenſure of* any part *till thou haſt read the* whole. *I have kept cloſe to the* main matter, *viz.* Infant-Baptiſm, *not omitting any Objection of the* Catechiſt *againſt it; but I have purpoſely ſlighted* by-matters, *leſt this Book ſhould be* voluminous, *or I ſeem to be* contentious *above what is meet. I have deſired to ſpeak* rationally *to the* cauſe, *and durſt not bring any* railing accuſation *againſt* perſons. *My* comfort *is this, the teſtimony of my* conſcience, *that* in ſimplicity and godly ſincerity *I have managed this matter, not daring* to talk deceitfully for God, *or willingly to wrong any. The worſt I wiſh to my Antagoniſts in this cauſe, is, that both they and I may be ready to* receive *every revealed* Truth of God *both in the* light *and* love *of it.*

---

THE

# THE Catechist Catechized: OR, AN EXAMINATION OF AN *Anabaptistical Catechism*,

Pretended to be Published for the Satisfaction and Information of the People of God in *Lancashire, &c.*

---

ANABAPT. CAT.

Q. *Who are fit Subjects for Baptism?*

A. *Only such as believe*, Acts 8. 12. 37. *also* Acts 16. 34. *also* 18. 8. Mat. 28. 19. *And such as repent*, Acts 2. 38. *and* Mat. 3. 6.

NOne of these Texts severally, nor all of them joyntly, do prove, That *only such as believe, and such as repent, are fit Subjects for Baptism*: nor do they so much as shew, That any son or daughter of Christian Parents (such as we baptize in Infancy) did believe, or repent, or make profession of Faith and Repentance before they were, or could be admitted to Baptism. *Exam. Chap. 1. §. 1.*

Acts 16. 34. doth not evince, that the Jaylors house or family rejoyced or believed, (as you seem to understand it;) for the Text

(ἠγαλλιάσατο and πεπιστευκώς, being of the singular number) may thus be read, He *believing, rejoyced*, or *expressed his joy (having believed) in all his house*, by feasting *Paul* and *Silas* in his house, whither he had brought them, *vers.* 34. Or (if by *house* be meant his Family) he rejoyced in or amongst his Family, because of the Promise made to him, *v.* 31. That if he did *believe in the Lord Jesus Christ* (as now he did) *he should be saved, and his house*: And if any Infants of the Jaylor might be in the number of those that should be *saved* (as you will confess they might,) why might they not be also in the number of those that were *baptized*? Besides, this *believing*, of whomsoever it is spoken, is not in the Text expressed to have been before they were baptized; for it is said, *ver.* 33. That *he and all his were baptized straightway*, or *immediately*; after which, *he brought them into his house, set meat before them, believing in God.* So this very Chapter, *v.* 14, 15. saith of *Lydia*, that *Paul* preached to her, and *she heard, and attended to those things that were spoken of Paul*; but none of these things are spoken of her house, yet they were baptized as well as she. It it true, it is said, that *Paul preached* to the Jaylor, and *to all that were in his house*, v. 32. and that *Crispus believed in the Lord with all his house, Acts* 18.8. Yet this (you know) doth not shew that there were none but actual Believers in the household. *Abraham Gen.* 18. 19. is said *to command his children and servants to keep Gods way*; and sure his house might be called a *believing house*: And now, we call *godly families, praying families*, though there be children in them not capable of understanding or obeying the Word, or of actual believing and praying. Now seeing the Jaylor, *Lydia*, and their, and other households, are said to be baptized, (as *Abraham* and his house were circumcised, *Gen.* 17.) and seeing children are part of the household, and often included (if not chiefly intended) under that name, 1 *Tim.* 5. 8. *Gen.* 34. 36. & 45. 18. & 46. 5. with *Exod.* 12. 1 *Sam.* 20. 15. 1 *King.* 17. 12, 18. with 15. and that there are so few families without little ones; Who dare affirm, and can prove, That there were none in these families? or that they were excluded from Baptism? seeing the Scripture doth not exclude them, (as elsewhere upon just cause it expresly doth, *Gen.* 50. 8.) Nor do we read of whole households admitted to the *Lords Supper*, as we do to *Baptism*, though your principles are as much for the *one* as for the *other*: So that some

Texts,

Texts, by you brought to overthrow *Infant-Baptism*, do afford at least a very probable Argument for it.

*Mat.* 3. 6. names *confessing of sin* (which is oft too far from *repentance*,) probably to *God*, not to *John*; or if to *John*, not a *particular* confession of each of them by himself (which Papists from hence urge,) for it was not possible for *John* to hear the particular confessions of so many, as for their multitude deserved to be called, *Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan*, in any convenient time: But whatsoever confession it was, it seems it was not *before* their Baptism (as you would have it) but *after*; for it saith, they were baptized, not ὁμολογησάμενοι, *having confessed*, but ὁμολογούμενοι, *confessing* their sins; and it is not said, they were baptized because they had repented, but rather on the contrary, that *John's* Baptism was a Baptism *unto Repentance*, v. 11. This, you know, is consistent enough with Infant-Baptism. As for *Acts* 2. 38. it is probable, that *repentance*, to which (notwithstanding *their being pricked in their hearts*, v. 37.) the Apostle exhorts, was in them only in *fieri* before their Baptism, for immediately after this Exhortation they were baptized; and there could not be time to question three thousand in one day after Sermon (which, consisting of many main points, must needs be long, and *three* of the *twelve* hours of the day being spent before it begun, *v.* 15.) so as to make strict enquiry into, and to take distinct notice of the repentance of each of them. Of *Mat.* 28. 19. *Acts* 2. 38. and *Mat.* 3. 6. more hereafter. §. 2.

Suppose your Texts do shew, that the *Samaritans*, the *Eunuch*, the *Jaylor*, the *Corinthians*, and others, which were then aduk, and formerly either of the Jewish or Heathenish Religion, did believe, or profess faith and repentance, and were baptized; that is nothing to Pædobaptists, who never held, that a Jew or Heathen should be baptized without profession of faith. But grant further, That *actual Believers*, or *Professors*, are indeed the *primary* and *immediate* subject of Baptism, and in their own right, and their children are but the *secundary* subject, and may not be baptized but by a capacity derived unto them; and at that time Christian Churches were but *in gathering*, not *gathered*: The foundation was not to be layd in Infants, not in Infants only: And the sacred story, relating the manner of founding Churches, hath not so much occasion to speak of the Baptism of Infants, the *secundary* subject, as of §. 3.

actual Believers, the *primary*. God created the first man and woman of a perfect age, though all their posterity were born Infants: At first men of age were circumcised, *Gen.* 17.24. with 14.14. and again after some intermission of that Ordinance, *Josh.* 5.4. And if any Nation had been Proselyted, their men of age must first have been *taught* or *discipled*, and have made profession of faith before they should have been circumcised, though in the setled condition of the Jewish Church Child-circumcision was most in use. If Believers and Penitents ought to be baptized, will it thence follow, that none but they only are to be baptized? The rule is, *A proprio primo modo ad proprium secundo modo non valet argumentum:* All Crows are black, therefore none but only Crows are black, is no good argument. If it were granted, that Infant-Baptism cannot be proved by *those* Texts, yet it will not follow, that it cannot be proved by any *other* Texts. Womens admission to the Supper, though it cannot be proved by *Mat.* 26. *Mark* 14. *Luk.* 22. (*Christ* admitting only men,) may notwithstanding be proved by other Scriptures. Your notion [That *none are to be baptized but such as they were, whose Baptism is mentioned* Acts 8. 12, 37. & 16.34.&c.] is by some further improved, saying, All those were such Believers as had been in person Jews or Heathens, and therefore such *only* are to be baptized; and *those that have Christian Parents, and were educated in Christianity from their childhood, are not (at least not by virtue of any of those Texts) to be baptized at all, neither in Infancy, nor when they make Profession.* As they in their case, so also you in your case are to blame, to insert into your Answer the word [*only*] which you find in none of your Texts. Our Scripture-grounds for Infant-Baptism you shall hear anon, *Chap.* 10.

---

ANABAPT. CAT.

Q. *What grounds have you against Infant-Baptism?*

A. *Many; but chiefly Christs Commission,* Mat. 28. 19. *Where the subjects of Baptism are those that are made Disciples, and this Commission is to last to the Worlds end,* v. 20. *and reacheth to every creature that is to partake of Baptism, Mark* 16. 15, 16.

*Examinat. Cap. 2. §. 1.]* *Matth.* 28. 19. is not the *first* Commission for *baptizing*, no more then for *preaching*. *John Baptist*, Mat. 3. and Christs Disciples

Disciples, *Joh.* 4. 1, 2. did baptize before this, and had commission for it, *Joh.* 1. 33. *Mat.* 21. 25, 26. which Christ confirmed by his being baptized by *John*, *Mat.* 3. 13. Yea we have express Examples in Jewish Records of a Baptism, which was a Rite of initiation into the Jewish Church, a concomitant of Circumcision, if not ancienter: So *Jacob*, admitting the preserved *Sechemites* into communion (all of age being women,) bad them, be washed or *baptized*, or cleansed by washing, *Gen.* 35. 2. which is the reason why a Jewish *Proselyte* is in *Arrianus* called Βαβδιζομενος, a *baptized person*: Hence the Jews did not question *John's* Baptism as a new and unusual Rite, (they were already well acquainted with it,) but his Authority to administer it. *Grotius* on *Mat.* 3. 6. conceives it was begun upon occasion, and to preserve the memory of the purging of the World by the Deluge, and that *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. signifies so much, calling Baptism the *Antitype* and *figure* of it. And the Infants of the Jews were thus admitted, as well as the Proselyte, for *one Ordinance was for both*, *Numb.* 15. 15. And thus the *Hebrew* Doctors assert, (notwithstanding Mr *T.* to the contrary pretends, that the Proselytes only were baptized because they were unclean,) That *Israel*, as well as others, *entred into Covenant*, *Males by three things*, viz. *Circumcision*, *Baptism*, *and Offering*; *Females only by the two last*. Now, as *Christ*, aboliſhing the Passover, took the *postcœnium*, or common custom used at the Passover, of the Master of the Family, his *breaking a piece of bread, and distributing it, and a cup of wine*, amongst the company, to be materials of the *Lords Supper*; so he (aboliſhing Circumcision and Offering) advanced this ancient usual unquestionable concomitant of Circumcision, and of initiation of Males, Females, Infants, or others, into the Church, to be a *Sacrament* of the *New Testament*, the *use* whereof, and the *persons* to whom it should be administred, being then ordinarily and commonly known, the Scripture did not need to record the commission or warrant given to *John*, or that the Jews had long before for their baptizing. It was enough, that there is not the least hint in the Word, that Baptism, when advanced to be a divine Sacrament of the New Testament, should not be applyed to Infants as it was before. Indeed when the Apostles Commission was to be enlarged to *all Nations*, (this being a new thing, and rarely known or believed,) it was needful that it should be set down *in terminis*, as it

See Mr *Selden*, Dr *Hammond*, Dr *Lightfoot*, Mr *Ainsworth*, Mr *Towlys*.

here is: And yet this Gospel was not written till about eight years after the Ascension of *Christ*, and other Gospels were writ some years after this, the Jewish Church all this while being guided by the Old Testament, and observing the Jewish lawful Rites and Customs, and this of baptizing doubtless amongst others.

§. 2. You say, *The subjects of Baptism in the Text are such as are made Disciples, and therefore Christs Commission is against any other being baptized*, particularly *against Infant Baptism*. But may not I as solidly argue, 1. The persons here commissionated to baptize are such as were *made Apostles*, had the gift of tongues, they were to go to *all Nations*, therefore none but Apostles are to baptize? Or, 2. That none are to be baptized, but such as by teaching or preaching the Gospel to them are *made Disciples*, though they be (as you know it is possible) converted by other means? These Inferences, though weak, are as strong as yours: For suppose the Apostles being to *Baptize the Nations* or Heathens (for to that ἔθνη relates notwithstanding the gender here, as wel as *Act.* 15.17. & 28.28. & 13.48. *Rom.* 9.24. 15.) were to preach to them, and thereby make them Disciples doth that forbid that those that are already Discipled should have their children Baptized? None but *Disciples* were to be circumcised amongst the Jews *Act.* 15. 10. and yet children were circumcised. If the Lord had given Commission to *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah* or any others to Proselite *all* or *some Nations*, it had not been any whit incongruous and inconsistent with child circumcision if the commission had run in these very words, *Go teach all Nations*, or *this* or *that Nation*, and *Heathen people*, and *circumcise them*, and how then can the like speech be contrary to Infant Baptism, especially seeing it was a thing so commonly known that Infants were *Baptized* as well as *Circumcised*: see Sect. 1. And Infants are as considerable a part of *the* other *Nations*, as they were of the Jews, in reference to whom other people were called גוים or *Heathen*: and *all Nations* (*i. e.* some of all Nations or some of each sort in the Nations, Infants amongst others *should be blessed in Abraham*, *Gen.* 18.18. He saith not, *grown persons*, much less doth he say, *grown persons only*; but, *all Nations*: nor is there any appearance of taking away by this Text any privilege from Jewish Beleevers or their children,

childr.n, but only of enlarging their priviledges unto the Gentiles; The Apostles being commanded, that as they had preached the Gospel, and Sacramentally initiated the Jews only, so now they should do the same to others also.

If you insist upon the order of the words, and argue thence, that *teaching* (as the word is translated) must go before *baptizing*, you know there is no necessity, that what is set first in Scripture must alway be done first; sometimes preaching is put before baptizing, and sometimes baptizing before preaching, *Mark* 1.4. sometimes repentance before faith, *Mark* 1.15. glory before virtue, 2 *Pet.* 1.3. &c. and here, as teaching is put *before* Baptism, so it is also put *after* Baptism, vers. 20. To avoyd tautology in the words, *Go teach-baptizing-teaching*, some godly learned men conceive the word μαθητεύσατε should be translated *make Disciples*, or *disciple* all Nations, which was the end of their mission; *baptizing* and *teaching them*, were the means of discipling them; whether they be set down in exact order of time or no, is not material. You (it seems) urge the word in this sence, and say in effect, *that Infants are not Disciples.* It is answered both, that the phrase to *disciple*, or *make Disciples*, answers an Hebrew phrase among the *Rabbins* (the New Testament frequently using their phrases in their sence) which signifies *admission to be taught*, though they were *not yet taught*, and in common use. Children the first day they go to school, before they know any letter, or have any actual willingness to learn, are called Scholers (the same with Disciples) of such a Master: And he that is listed in an Army is called a Soldier, though possibly he know little or nothing of the art military: And Infants are Disciples in the sence and language of Scripture, as *Act.* 15.10. *Those upon whose neck the yoke* of circumcision (for of that he speaks, as appears by Vers. 1,5,24.) *was put*, were not *only* nor *mostly* adult, but Infants; nor did the Synod determine against the circumcision of grown men *only*, but *also* of Infants: Children are evidently called *Gods servants*, *Levit.* 25.41,42. and they are as well *disciples*, as *servants.* If *Adam* had not fallen, his children should have been disciples and servants of God (and so was *Christ* in his minority) notwithstanding their infancy. Besides, it appears by comparing *Mat.* 10.42. & 18.3,4,5. *Luk.* 9.47,48. & *Mark* 9.41. that the *same persons* which

§. 3.

*Which belong to Christ* (from which priviledg Infants in general are not warrantably excluded) *are* also *the Disciples of Christ*, and that Infants are quickly capable of knowing Mothers and Nurses from others of being taught actions and gestures by them, and sensible of other things is very evident; much more are they capable of being taught by Christ, whose Disciples they are, according to that promise, a part of the new Covenant, *Jer.*31.34. *Isai.*54.13. (others being but Gods ushers and pet-masters, *Eph.*6.2.) their Souls being as capable of being taught by *God a Spirit*, and *Father of spirits*, in their *minor*, as in their *riper* years; and experience teacheth, that some (not to mention *Jeremy* and *John Baptist*) being sanctified from their infancy (so far as can possibly be discerned by men) have chosen the good, and hated the evil; a thing which neither their own nature nor the art of man could teach them. When Parents beleeve, God makes himself over to them and theirs to be their God, and to teach them, and they make themselves and theirs over to him to be his people and disciples, and so children are discipled when their parents are; and if they be *discipled*, then by your own argument *they are fit subjects of Baptism by virtue of Christs Commission*. Thus that which you call your chief Argument against Pœdobaptism appears for it, not against it: Christs Command of *discipling all Nations*, and *baptizing them*, doth not exclude a part, and great part too, of the Disciples of the Nations: *Et non restringendum ubi Scriptura non restringit*; If the Scripture doth not limit it self, we must not limit it: You could tell us of households without children, but sure you will not tell us of *Nations* without children.

§. 4. As for *the lasting of this Commission to the worlds end, and the reaching of it to every creature that is to partake of Baptism*, *Mar.* 16. 15, 16. If you will maintain the very same Commission in *Mat.* 28. & *Mar.* 16. to reach so far and to last so long, and to be inalterable in any thing, you should clear up these three things. 1. That some persons are now commissionated from God (as the Apostles hereby were) *to go into all the world*, and *to teach all Nations*. 2. That *casting of Devils, speaking with tongues, healing the sick*, &c. mentioned *Mark* 16. are to be perpetually in the Church. 3. That Infants are there intended under the name of *every creature*, and that of them God doth require

require actual believing, as of as great or greater neceſſity to *Salvation* then to *Baptiſm*: The words are not, *He that believeth not, ſhall not be baptized*, but *ſhall be damned*: And are you as confident that all Infants are *damned*, as you are that none of them ſhould be *baptized*? I wonder you dare urge this Text againſt Infant-Baptiſm, which your own heart tells you is as much or more againſt their *Salvation*, then againſt their *Baptiſm*. For my part, I conceive Infants are not to be ſcrued up to that proportion which God requireth of adult perſons: *The Lord will take vengeance on them that know not God, that obey not his Goſpel*, 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 8. *Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, &c. Mat.* 3. 10. Muſt therefore Infants either *know God, obey the Goſpel, and bring forth fruit*, or be damned? May we not feed and clothe Infants, becauſe the Word ſaith, *He that will not labor, muſt not eat*, 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 10. Might not the Jews admit Infants into the viſible Church, becauſe the Pſalmiſt deſcribes the Citizen of *Sion* (you ſay, a Church-member) *walking uprightly, working righteouſneſs, ſpeaking the truth in love, contemning vile perſons? &c.* Pſal. 15. 1, 2, &c. The application is eaſie.

---

ANABAPT. CAT.

Q. *What other grounds have you againſt Infant-Baptiſm?*

A. *Infants are not fit ſubjects for Baptiſm becauſe they do not believe, they have not reaſon to diſcern between good and evil*, Deut. 1. 39. *Faith is an act of the underſtanding, which cometh by hearing, as well as an act of the Will; and it is unlawful to baptize perſons without they believe*, Acts 8. 37. *if thou believeſt, it is lawful*, Act. 10. 47. & 8. 12. & 18. 8.

ALL the Texts you now produce have been anſwered before in the firſt Chapter; ſave *Acts* 10. 47. from which you may collect, That thoſe that had the *gift of the Holy Ghoſt* (as it is called *v.* 45.) and *could ſpeak with tongues*, *v.* 46. were to be baptized; but ſure you will not infer thence, That thoſe that have not the ſaid gifts are not to be baptized: If you do, you will deny all Baptiſm that is now adays, and turn *Seeker*. But as by your Principles you hold Confeſſion of Faith and Repentance ſufficient to *Examinat. Cap.* 3. §. 1.

Baptiſm, without thoſe gifts; ſo you ſhould ſhew, that the foreſaid gift, and ſpeaking with tongues, was in ſtead of their believing and repenting; or elſe confeſs, that you impertinently alledg this Text.

§. 2. I muſt now ask you once for all, what you mean by *Believers?* whether ſuch only as have a true juſtifying Faith; or all that make profeſſion of Faith, whether indeed and in truth they have a true juſtifying Faith or no? The firſt is requiſite in *foro Dei, & conſcientiæ, & ex parte baptizati*, that our Baptiſm may be acceptable to God, and comfortable to us, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. So the *Eunuch* deſiring Baptiſm with the ſaving benefit thereof, and asking, not, *What doth hinder thee from baptizing me?* but, *What doth hinder me*— was anſwered, *If thou believeſt with all thy heart, thou mayſt.* But in *foro Eccleſiæ, & ex parte baptizantis*, the latter ſufficeth for admiſſion, your ſelf being judg: No Scripture-rule was tranſgreſſed when *Judas*, *Simon Magus*, *Ananias* and *Sapphira* were baptized. The *Eunuch's* profeſſion, That he *believed Jeſus Chriſt to be the Son of God*, ſufficed to preſent admiſſion of him to Baptiſm. And ſurely not the *inward* and *ſpiritual* qualifications, but the outward and viſible eſtate of perſons to be baptized is to be looked at; and we ſhould deſcend to the *loweſt* (perſonal profeſſion of Faith and Repentance being the *higheſt*) degree of viſibility: Suppoſe a Miniſter had a ſpirit to diſcern the inward eſtate of men as certainly as *Chriſt* did of *Judas*, and poſſibly the Apoſtles did of ſome which they baptized; yet were he not to withhold from any, for want of inward grace, the priviledges which they have right and title to by virtue of their viſible eſtate. Saint *Auguſtin* and others think, *Judas* was admitted to the Lords Supper, though he but received *panem Domini*, not *panem Dominum*: and Mr *Cartwright* alſo ſo judgeth, from that connection, *Luk.* 22. 19, 20, 21. Certainly he was admitted to the Paſſover by virtue of his viſible eſtate. *Iſhmael* and *Eſau* were regularly circumciſed, though *Abraham* knew that the one, and *Rebecca* that the other, was not the Elect ſeed of the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 19, 20. with 23. & 25. 23 *Rom.* 9 12. We can but *charitably* judg, not *infallible* know, who are Believers; and though Infants do not actually believe, yet by the judgment of charity (if that be our rule) we ought to judg, that Infants born of Chriſtian Parents are regenerate, and have faith habitual, or the principle or ſeed of it,

ſo

ſo much as is abſolutely neceſſary to their participation of Chriſt, and Salvation by him, and that they dying in Infancy are ſaved: ſee *Chap.* 5. For though they cannot *actually* believe, or at leaſt not make a profeſſion of their Faith, yet they are not to be doomed *Infidels*, no more then they are to be judged *irrational* or *dumb*, becauſe they cannot actually reaſon or ſpeak; and therefore they (unleſs you can reduce them to a third party, which will much ſtrengthen the Popiſh conceit of a third place for them when they dye, *Limbus Infantûm,*) are to be counted *Believers*; and ſo methinks Chriſt accounteth of them, *Mat.* 18. 6. with 4.

§. 3. Ever ſince God gathered a diſtinct number out of the World to be his Church, viſible Kingdom, City and Houſhold, in oppoſition to the reſt of the World, which is the viſible Kingdom, City, or Houſhold of *Satan*, God would have the Infants of all who are taken into Covenant, to be accounted *his*, and to belong to his Church and Family, and not to the Devils. If *Adam* had kept the Covenant of Works, his Infant ſeed had been righteous; *Adam* breaking that Covenant, his Infant ſeed was guilty of that breach, and became ſinners againſt the Law, though they knew not what the Law, or ſin againſt it, was: *Adam* being within the Covenant of Grace, his Infant ſeed was ſo judged likewiſe: For by *ſeed of the woman, Geneſ.* 3. 15. is meant Chriſt in his *minority*, as well as in his *grown years*, who dyed for Infants as well as others, neither are Infants to be excluded from the benefit of that Promiſe: The Infants of *Noah*, *Abraham*, and the *Jews*, were members of the ſame Church with their Parents: As Infants of *Jews*, *Turks*, and *Pagans*, though uncapable of thoſe Opinions or Practiſes, are eſteemed *Jews*, *Turks*, *Pagans*; ſo the Infants of Chriſtians (though, as the children of men, they are *born in ſin*, *Pſal.* 51. 5. *dead in it*, *Epheſ.* 2. 1, 3.) yet, as *children of the Church*, they are viſibly Chriſtians, not *Infidels*, *Jews*, *Turks*, or *Pagans*. Though a Noble-man, a Free-man of a Corporation, a viſible Church-member, do beget children as men, not as a perſon of Honor, a Free-man, a Church-member; yet according to their reſpective Charters, the Honor of the one, the Freedom of the other, and Church-priviledges of the third, may deſcend on their children.

Q. *What other Arguments have you to prove, That Infants have not Faith, and are not to be baptized?*

A. *If they had Faith, they were presently to be admitted to the Supper, and not excluded from communion therein, as many are, which are admitted to communion in Baptism, whereas the communion in both is one and the same, the same thing signified in both,* viz. *our fellowship with Christ in his Death and Resurrection: So that all that are baptized into one body, are all made to drink into one Spirit,* 1 Cor. 12.13. *and the same preparations of Faith and Repentance are required for both; and he that is cast out of the one, is cast out of the other, seeing by excommunication he is like an Heathen or Publican.*

*Exam. Chap.* 4. §. 1. IT is the Judgment both of Mr *Rutherford*, and Mr *Hooker*, and others of *New-England*, *That Infants of visible Churches, born of wicked Parents, members of the same Churches, ought to be baptized:* The reason may be, We (when a Child is presented to Baptism) are to take notice of the Parents Church-membership, not of his scandalousness: If the Church do not cast out the Parents, why should the Minister cast out the Child? Parents, where suspended, lose only their present fruition, not their fundamental right to membership: It is right to membership, not the present fruition of it, nor their worthiness of that right, doth (as they conceive) transfer that priviledg to Infants. Mr *Cotton* in his *Way*, p. 115. conceives it is considerable, *if the Grandfather or Grandmother, making profession, be still living, and willing to undertake for the Child*; yea, that in some cases a *Heathens child may be baptized in right of its houshold-governor, Gen.* 17. Yet it is very far from their Opinions, That these children, or the immediate Parents of them should be admitted to the Supper.

§. 2. Amongst the Jews Infants were circumcised, yet were they not presently admitted to the Passover; they could not *come up* (nor do we read they were *carryed*) from the remote parts of *Judea* to *Jerusalem*, where only the Lamb was eaten, nor could they eat it standing *with staves in their hands*, and *with sowr herbs*, as was required, *Exod.* 12. nor *keep it to the Lord*, vers. 46. with spiritual

ſpiritual reſpects to Gods glory, to Gods ends and rules, and to have their *hearts prepared*, as well as to be ceremonially clean, 2 *Chron.* 18. 19. and the ſame males were as well to be at the feaſt of tabernacles (as at the Paſſover) and to carry boughs (which was no Infants work) to make booths or tabernacles to dwell in, *Deut.*16.16,17. with *Levit.*23.34,35.38,39.40. The children, yea thoſe that could ſpeak and ask queſtions, did not partake of the Paſſover, as is implyed in that they did not ſay, what mean *we*, but what mean *you* by this ſervice? *It was not allowable to count* them for the eating of the Paſſover *that could not eat of it*, viz. *Infants, ſick perſons, uncircumciſed and unclean*; ſee *Ainſw.* in *Exod.* 12. 4. The uncleanneſs of a Proſelyte was no bar to Circumciſion, but to the Paſſover it was, *Numb.*9.6, 10. An adult Proſelyte might in ſome caſe be circumciſed and baptized, and not preſently admitted to the Paſſover: *Ainſw.* in *Exod.*12.44.

The Rite of Baptiſm is after the common cuſtom of *waſhing new born Infants* from the pollutions of the womb, *Ezek.*16. 5,9. but the elements of *bread and wine are the food of riper* years. Baptiſm is a Sacrament of *Initiation* (as *Bernard* calls it,) the Supper is the *higheſt* Ordinance, Chriſtians (as ſuch) are capable of. It is one thing to be *admitted a Scholar* in a School, or to be *matriculated* into the Univerſity; another thing to be of *ſuch a form, ſtanding*, or *degree*: It is one thing to be a ſubject, a tenant, or free of a Corporation (which children may be,) another to do homage, ſuit and ſervice. Our Regeneration or birth in Chriſt (whereof Baptiſm is the laver) Infants are capable of; but not of that growth and augmentation ſignified in the Supper. To be baptized, is to be *paſſive* (as in the firſt act of Regeneration we are meerly paſſive) the action is wholly the Baptizers, *I baptize thee, &c.* but to eat and drink in remembrance of *Chriſts* death, and to diſcern the Lords body, is to be *active*, and requires exerciſes of reaſon and grace. And as *Chriſt* himſelf *did not adminiſter Baptiſm*, but his *Diſciples*, *Joh.*4.1,2. *Paul* ſaith, *God ſent him not to baptize*; the Apoſtles did not ſo uſually baptize, as ordinary Miniſters, 1 *Cor.*1.14,15,17. but Chriſt did adminiſter the Lords Supper, as alſo the chief Miniſter preſent did uſually afterward: So multitudes were *baptized* by *John Baptiſt*, and the Diſciples of *Chriſt*, which were not pre- §. 3.

ſently admitted to the Supper when *Chriſt* inſtituted it. The Apoſtles were to *teach all Nations, baptizing them*; but the *communicating of all Nations* is not expreſſed; of the *Samaritans* and ſeveral houſholds baptized, we read; of their preſent admiſſion to the Supper, we read not: So that though the communion in both the Sacraments be one, and the preparations for them both in adult perſons be the ſame for ſubſtance, yet becauſe of their different diſpenſations and degrees, Infants may be admitted to the one, and not to the other. Yet I freely and confidently aſſert, *that to admit children to the Supper, is far more excuſable then to deny them Baptiſm*; for they have *jus ad rem*, a right to it (as a young heir hath to his lands,) as Saints decayed in mind and body have a right to hear the Word; and the communicating of Infants is of more antiquity and credit in the Church, then denying of their Baptiſm; though I hold it not fit that Infants ſhould communicate, becauſe they have not *jus in re*, they have not aptitude and fitneſs for it: a child is not fit to manage his own eſtate; nor is it rational to preach the Goſpel to an holy man (what right ſoever he may have to it) when he is deſtitute of capacity to hear or underſtand it: and hence it is, that the Church having ſome while admitted Infants to the Lords Supper, did upon ſecond conſiderations diſcern her miſtake, and lay it aſide, but yet ſtill continued that other of baptizing Infants, ſeeing no cauſe to leave it off, but rather more ſtrictly to obſerve it.

---

ANABAPT. CAT.

Q. *But what if an Infant, or any other in their childhood, ſhould dye unbaptized, are they not damned?*

A. *We know nothing out of the Scripture of their Salvation or Damnation, and therefore we muſt not be too inquiſitive; yet may ſuch Infants ſo dying be ſaved, through the preſentment of the ſatisfaction of Chriſt to the juſtice of God for original ſin, which Satisfaction, though it be applyed through beleeving in thoſe that can beleeve, yet it may be applyed without in thoſe that cannot beleeve, elſe how could any Infants be ſaved?*

Chap. 5. IF you know nothing of their Salvation, *Chriſt* doth; *Mark* 10. 14. *Of ſuch*, ſaith he, *is the Kingdom of Heaven*: He means,

means, not only those that are meek, humble, harmless, *like little children*, (for he would not have *blamed those that would have kept little children from him*, nor have *blessed them* when they came, if they were only meer emblems of such as are blessed, as a Lamb or a Dove may be,) but *little children themselves*. *David* judged, that his child, though adulterously begotten, and whom God took away in his wrath, was saved, else he would not have eaten, and drunk, and rejoyced that he should go to it, 2 *Sam.*12.20. If any affirm, *That all Infants of Christians dying in Infancy are certainly saved*, I know no Scripture against it; and if there be no place punctually proving it, we are bound to encline to the more charitable opinion, *Mat.*7. 1. especially when we speak of this or that particular Infant. You say, they may be saved without Baptism; true, there is a possibility of it: so if Infants of the Jews had not been circumcised the eight day, and had dyed uncircumcised, they might also have been saved, (their parents or governors being guilty of the contempt or neglect of the Ordinance, not they; and why should their Salvation or Damnation depend upon others doing or not doing their duty?) That phrase of *cutting off*, *Gen.* 17. 14. either concerns grown men only, or threatens only *excommunication* or *death*, not eternal damnation. God had mercy on the penitent thief; yet it is presumption in us to defer repentance till death, or to neglect Baptism. God can bring a child into the world without a midwife; shall we therefore neglect the means? Parents when their children are baptized before they dye, may not only be comforted in the performance of their duty, but also have more grounded hopes of their childrens Salvation: Your Antipœdobaptistical Doctrines do take away all or most of the grounds of hope which Christian parents have of the Salvation of their dying Infants.

---

ANABAPT. CAT.

Q. *Whether do you think it were better for persons to have Baptism deferred till they be able to make a profession of faith.*

A. *Yes, it would be far better, for hereby the Churches would have right matter,* (i. e.) *Saints in profession, and persons*

*sons would be careful to get knowledg and holiness, whereas now they are careless of both: Infant-baptism brings many mischiefs, besides that it fills the Church with rotten members, confounds the Church and the World together, and is a groundwork for more traditions, and doth so darken the Doctrine of Baptism, that we cannot know the true meaning of it when we read it in Scripture.*

*Examinat. Cap. 6. §. 1.* THe many *mischiefs of Infant-Baptism*, and *the benefit of such delaying* of it, were unknown to the Apostolique Primitive Church, else sure they would have left us some Precept or President of their delaying the Baptism of the children of Christian parents. The Jewish Church had Child Circumcision and Child Baptism too as Rites of Initiation; had it been better they had been deferred? was not the Jewish Church to be freed from mischiefs (as you call them) as well as the Christian Church? If Childrens admission did not bring such mischiefs upon the Jewish, how comes it to be so mischievous to the Christian Church? We have a Command for Child-baptism, (not indeed such a direct express Command as they had for Circumcision,) but a virtual, implicite and consequential Command, as you shall hear anon, Chap. 10. and this is abundantly sufficient to clear it from being a cause of it self of any mischief at all.

§. 2. You hold and pretend to prove, that *John Baptist* and the Disciples of *Christ* did not baptize Infants; but were no rotten members baptized, when *Jerusalem, all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, came, and were baptized? Mat.* 3. *Mark* 1. yea that *people* or *multitude* whom, or some of whom, he called *Generation of Vipers, Luk.* 3. 7. with 21. Mr *Cobbet*, a *New-England* Divine, saith, *John Baptist did and might lawfully baptize those multitudes, albeit in the general he knew that many, yea most of them, would prove false and frothy.* Mr *Nyes*, another of them, saith, *The Apostles for the baptizing of three thousand expected no testimonies, nor a day (much less a month or years) experience, nor could they in so short time make any inquisitions, or hear any perswasive relations.* When all the *Samaritans*, very lately *bewitched* by *Simon Magus*, *Act.* 8. 9, 10. were baptized,

vers.

*verſ.* 12. was there then no rotten members? Suppoſe all *London, Middleſex*, and all the region round about *Thames* or *Trent*, ſhould be Jews or Heathens (and ſurely you account them now much better) and ſhould preſently upon hearing of a Sermon make ſome profeſſion of faith, or confeſſion of ſins, and be baptized, would you judg all theſe right matter, Saints, and that there is no rotten member amongſt them? What became of thoſe multitudes and Myriads of baptized ones when Chriſt ſuffered, or afterwards if they were not rotten members? Were not *Judas, Ananias, Saphira, Himeneus, Philetus*, and many others, rotten members? Were there not amongſt the *Corinthians* (though called *Saints, a parte meliore*; as we call a Wheat-field a Corn-field, though we ſee many tares and thiſtles in it) known carnal Schiſmatiques, Fornicaters, Idolaters, ſome that ſacrificed to Devils, drunken Communicants, Heretiques denying the Reſurrection, Deſpiſers of *Paul*, Admirers of the falſe Teachers, Men (as *Paul* feared) that *had not repented of the uncleanneſs, fornication and laſciviouſneſs they had committed*, amongſt whom *were debates, envyings, wraths, ſtrifes, backbitings, whiſperings, ſwelling tumults, &c.* were none of theſe rotten members? It is the work of the Miniſtry to convince rotten members of their rottenneſs, and by the bleſſing of God to convert them, and make them ſound, 1 *Cor.* 5. & 6. & 10. *Gal.* 4. 19. And if ſo be they remain incurable, and after much means, pains and patience are not reclaimed, the Church may cut them off. Though the *draw-net doth take in both good and bad*, yet *the bad* afterward *may be caſt away*, *Matth.* 13. 47. 48.

Are there not alſo amongſt the Anabaptiſts (notwithſtanding their rejection of Infant-Baptiſm) many rotten members, Heretiques, Blaſphemers, ſuch as deny the Trinity, the Divinity or Humanity of Jeſus Chriſt, the Immortality of the Soul, the Morality of the Sabbath, Authority of the Scriptures, the guilt of original ſin, the neceſſity, yea very being of the Miniſtry, Officers and Ordinances; Aſſertors of the whole Body of Arminianiſm, of immediate Revelations and Enthuſiaſms, of Antinomianiſm, of Poligamy, perfection of grace? Who more then the Anabaptiſts (I had almoſt ſaid, who but they) have been given up by God to thoſe ſtrong and ſtrange deluſions, §. 3.

to those damnable Opinions and abominable Practices mentioned in the late Act? Where is there a more wicked and wretched Sect then the *Ranters*? But (possibly) you that published this Catechism may be of the strictest Sect of your Religion, (as the worst of these at their first separating from us seemed also to be,) and do abhor to have communion not only with these, but with Drunkards, Adulterers, Swearers, &c. To you I say, if there be not amongst you Drunkards, Adulterers, Swearers, &c. (Satan himself is none of these,) but are there not seditious, schismatical persons, that say, all *the Church is holy*? sacrilegious persons, that *devour that which is holy*, or dedicated to the service of God and his Church, not by themselves (which was *Ananias* his sin) but by others? Are there not Murderers, Railers, false Accusers, Lyars, proud, boasters, covetous, traytors, heady, high-minded, lovers of themselves, despisers of good men, having a form of godliness? &c. Such an one is Satan. As for the rotten members in Pædobaptists Congregations, they are or should be duly proceeded against, and much good is done that way in many Congregations where Government is set up, and people help forward the work, (humane infirmities both in Rulers and ruled ever have been, and will be:) And more good had been done, had not the separation of some from us, the exemption by the Civil Powers from Church-government, of whosoever will not freely own it, the unjust clamors of *Presbyterian* Rigidness and Tyranny, together with the Tumults and Troubles of the Times, hindred it.

§. 4. As for Infant-Baptism, *it is a consecrating of children to God, and formally initiates them into the Church, which is a great benefit*, (as casting out, or excommunicating out of the Church, is a great censure,) *it is an outward distinctive sign of Christians children from Pagans, signifies their original sin, and necessity of regeneration, even before the commission of actual sin, and the Salvation of Infants, as well as grown men, by Christ: It makes Infants partakers of the Ordinances, at least of the Prayers of the Church, as members thereof; it pre-engageth them to a Christian Course, when they have the least prejudice and abstruction against it; and as soon as they are capable to receive the nurture and admonition of the Lord, to frequent Ordinances, to own Jesus Christ by external profession; it binds Parents to be more careful and conscientious of their Religious Education, it comforts their hearts*

*hearts* (godly Parents may ſpeak this experimentally) *to ſee their children thus ſealed, in aſſurance that God is their God, and the God of their ſeed:* Yea God doth ſometimes, yea always (as we ought to judg, till the contrary appear) baptize them *inwardly*, or infuſe grace, or the ſeed of it, into the Soul of the baptized Infant: Theſe, and the like were counted great benefits in the time of the Law; and are they, or can they be miſchiefs in the time of the Goſpel? You aſſert indeed, That *delaying of Baptiſm would make men careful to get knowledg and holineſs, whereas now they* (viz. they that do not delay Baptiſm) *are careleſs of both:* But may they not be as conſcientiouſly taught, and as careful and apt to learn in Chriſts School in his viſible Kingdom, as out of it? baptized, as unbaptized? Are not many grown perſons as forgetful and careleſs of the Promiſes they make on their ſick beds, and other occaſions, as of thoſe which were made in Infancy? Are *Anabaptiſts* the only men that are careful to get knowledg and holineſs? Are not multitudes of perſons, which were baptized in their Infancy, as careful to get knowledg and holineſs, and as good Proficients therein, as any others? Is it better, not to put children into a leaſe or grant of a priviledg, leſt they ſhould be ſecure and careleſs to pay rent and do homage, then to put them in? May not deferring of Baptiſm ſo long, make them deſpiſe it when they come to age? Satan may more eaſily keep children, when grown up, from receiving Chriſtianity, then work them to renounce it; though *he ſometimes prevails with Witches and Wizzards to renounce their Baptiſm* (received in Infancy) that they may be his vaſſals, and more aſſured to him. Keeping the children of Chriſtians out of the Church, is a ſtrange way (ſure it is none of Gods ways, nor is it likely to prevail) to make them in love with Chriſtianity. If any good can be done by ſuch *mediums*, the warrantable deferring of the Lords Supper alone may do it, as well as the unwarrantable delaying of Baptiſm. As for *darkening the Doctrine of Baptiſm*, experience teacheth us, that the Doctrine thereof was clear enough in Scripture, and competently underſtood, as well as the Doctrine of the Lords Supper, before ſuch oppoſition hath been made to Infant-Baptiſm: If it be now darkened, the darkneſs is not from Infant-Baptiſm, but from your oppoſite Opinion and Practice.

Q. *But may not Infants be baptized, if they be Abrahams ſeed?*

A. *Yes; But we Gentiles are only Abrahams ſeed by believing,* Gal. 3. 7. *ſo* Rom. 4. 16. Gal. 3. 29. *They that would make the children of Believers to be the ſeed of Abraham, are miſtaken; for the Scripture ſpeaketh but of three ſeeds of Abraham,* viz. *Chriſt,* Gal. 3. 16. 2. *The carnal ſeed:* 3. *The Believer, Jew or Gentile,* Gal. 3. 28. *And they add a fourth ſeed of Abraham,* viz. *the ſeed or children of Believers amongſt the Gentiles, about which the Scripture is ſilent.*

*Exam. Chap. 7.* EIther you do not ſufficiently *enumerate*, or *not rightly underſtand your enumeration* of the Scripture-kinds of *Abrahams* ſeed, or both. For, 1. *Chriſt perſonal* is not the whole of *Abrahams* ſeed, *to* whom (though he be the whole *in* whom, 2 *Cor.* 1. 20.) the Promiſes were made; but *Chriſt myſtical*, the whole Church of *Chriſt*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12, 13. all which, *whether Jews or Gentiles, bond or free,* (I may add, *young or old*) are but *one in their Head Jeſus Chriſt*, Gal. 3. 28. *All that are Chriſts are Abrahams ſeed*, verſ. 29. and Infants are his, as well as grown perſons; for he became an *Infant*, ſuffered much in his very *Infancy*, was the Head of the Church while an *Infant* (and therefore might well have *Infant-members,*) dyed for *Infants* as well as for grown men, bad his Diſciples to ſuffer little children to come to him, (if not that he might baptize them, (for he *baptized none at all*, Infants or others, *Joh.* 4. 1, 2.) yet that he might *bleſs them,*) and ſaid, that *of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven.* 2. As for the carnal ſeed of *Abraham*, their *fleſhly relation* was not ſufficient to entitle them to Church-priviledges, except they had a *ſpiritual* relation alſo, *Rom* 9. 6, 8. Open Apoſtates, and Revolters, though the carnal ſeed of *Abraham*, were not counted of the Church, but as *ſtrangers*, and *Heathens*, as *David* calls them, *Pſal.* 54. 3. & 59. 5. That Text, *Exod.* 12. 48. *prohibiting ſtrangers, did by the rule of proportion prohibit from the Paſſover all ſuch Jews as did forſake the Faith:* The *Caldee Paraphraſt* ſaith, *No ſon of Iſrael, that is an Apoſtate, or fallen from the Faith, ſhall eat of it.*

*Cain*

*Cain* and his posterity were rejected, *Gen.* 4. 15, 16. *cum Gen.* 6. 1, 2. So *Ishmael* cast out, and the *Ishmaelites*, *Gal.* 4 30. *Gen.* 21. 10, 14. *Psal.* 83. 6. which last place mentions the *Edomites* also, which were the posterity of *Abraham*; yea, all the twelve Tribes, which were the seed of *Abraham*, were cast off at the last: and yet their being begotten after the flesh, and being circumcised in the flesh, was an help, not an hindrance, to their being begotten of the Promise, or to Circumcision in the Spirit. *Jacob* was of *Isaac* and *Rebecca* after the flesh, and yet also the heir of Promise: And as then some *were born* only *after the flesh*, as *Ishmael*, *Esau*; and *some were* also *born after the spirit*, as *Isaac*, *Jacob*: So the Apostle (looking not only to the *Parallel*, but to the *History*) saith, *So it is now*; some, even in the time of the Gospel, are born of Christian Parents only *after the flesh*, and some also *after the spirit*, and these do persecute one another, *Gal.* 4. 29. This difference may discover it self in riper years, but in Infancy it is as undiscoverable now as then. 3. It was not necessary that they should be the carnal seed of *Abraham* that were in Covenant-relation, and initiated into the Church; for *Abraham* was (as to this) not only the *father of the Jews*, but of *many Nations*, and upon this account his name was changed, *Gen.* 17. 4, 5. Proselytes being *Gentiles* as well as we, and not of his *carnal seed*, nor (many) so much as *of his family*, yet they were the seed of *Abraham* by *believing*, as wel as we are now; and they were not only initiated into the Church, but those of them that were of *Abrahams* family were the foundationals, and first members of the Church, as constituted in *Abrahams* family; his 318 *trained servants*, besides others, were not all (if any) of his carnal seed. 4. As for the Infants of Believers, which you separate from their Parents (of which see before *Chap.* 3. §. 3.) and make them a *fourth seed*, you know that Proselytes became *Abrahams* seed only by believing, as (you say) we *Gentiles* now do, and yet their children were accounted *Abrahams* seed (though they be none of the *three* which you mention,) and as such were initiated into the Church, *Gen.* 17. 12, 23. *Exod.* 12. 48, 49. In the same sence that *Abraham* was a *father* to a Proselyte, or *believing Gentile and his seed* then, he is a *father to a Christian Gentile and his seed* now, for his Paternity abides the same; nor can you shew a better warrant for his Paternity over the *one*, then over the other, nor have the *Gentiles* lost any priviledg by the coming of Christ

which they had before: The Scripture ſaith, *The Brethren now are the children of the Promiſe, as Iſaac was, Gal.* 4. 28. Now *Iſaac* was the ſeed of *Abraham*, and in the Promiſe as an Infant of believing Parents, before he was an actual Believer, and his Infants were within the Covenant, and accordingly initiated into the Church. *Abraham* might ſay, *God is my God, and the God of my Infant ſeed*, and ſo might the *Gentile* proſelyted ſay alſo; and why may not a Chriſtian, who is *bleſſed with faithful Abraham*, *Gal.* 3. 9. ſay ſo too? eſpecially ſeeing *Jeſus Chriſt, the Miniſter of Circumciſion*, did not abrogate, but *confirm the Promiſes made unto the fathers, and that the Gentiles might glorifie God for his Mercy, &c. Rom.* 15. 8, 9. God, alluding to the outward Circumciſion of his people, and their ſeed, promiſeth to *circumciſe their hearts, and the hearts of their ſeed, Deut.* 30. 6. and this promiſe is *Goſpel*, and a *parcel of the Covenant of Grace*, as appears by *Deut.* 30. 6, 10, 11, 12. with *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8. and this circumciſion of the heart is commended *Rom.* 2. 28, 29. and is ſignified and ſealed in Baptiſm, *Coloſ.* 2. 11, 12. It is obſerved, that *Gen.* 17. 7. ſpeaks not of *Abraham* and his ſeed (which (you ſay) are actual Believers) abſtractedly taken, but of *his ſeed in their generations*, which words neceſſarily imply and include, as the *Parents generating*, ſo *the Children generated*. Laſtly, *Abraham* is not only called the father of particular Believers, but the *father of Nations* profeſſing the true faith, as well as of the *Jewiſh Nation*: Every Nation receiving the true Faith as they did, and in which there is a National Agreement in Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline, as was in the Nation of the *Jews*, is an *holy Nation, a peculiar people to the Lord*, even *Egypt* and *Aſſyria*, with *Iſrael*, and may call *Abraham* father, *Iſai.* 19. 21. *Gen.* 17. 5. When the *Gentiles were graffed into that ſtock from which the Jews were broken off, and did partake of the root and fatneſs of the Olive tree, Rom.* 11. 17. and *Abraham* began to be the *father of many Nations*, *Rom.* 4. 16, 17. Regenerate Infants are *Abrahams* ſpiritual ſeed by Mr *T.* his confeſſion, and he profeſſeth that he would baptize them, if he could know them. I am ſure no one dare ſay of this or that particular Infant, that it is not regenerate; yea, we are bound to judg they are ſuch, till ſomething appear to the contrary.

ANA-

ANABAPT. CAT.

Q. *But are not the children of godly persons visibly in the Covenant of Grace?*

A. *No, the Covenant of Grace is an invisible thing, and we cannot know who are in it, nor have we grounds to judg persons are in it, till we see some profession of holy life of faith and repentance, which Infants cannot make.*

NOt to speak of such as are only *intentionally* in the Covenant of Grace, as *children yet unborn* may be, *Dent.* 29.15. Those that are *Actually* in the Covenant of Grace, are of two sorts: Some are *externally* in it, as *Ishmael, Judas, Simon Magus*, and so all such as own God to be their God, and themselves to be his people (as the Jewish Church did, and every true Christian Church doth) though but *externally* are said to be within the Covenant: Your self say, that *profession of faith and repentance are grounds to judg some persons to be in the Covenant of Grace.* There is external *being in Christ, Joh.* 15.2. *Vocation, Mat.* 22. 14. *Sanctification, Heb.* 10. 29. and *purging from sin, 2 Pet.* 1.9. But some are also *internally* and savingly in the Covenant of Grace, as *Isaac, Jacob*, while Infants, and when adult, also *Zacheus, Lydia* and *her household*, the Jaylor and *all his*. This distinction is grounded upon *Rom.* 9. 4, 6, 7, 8. We may know who is in the Covenant of Grace *externally*; but the Covenant of Grace in the second sence is invisible, and none could know who were in it in the time of the Jews (though Infants were then *visibly* in it, and initiated as such) or amongst Christians. If the *invisibleness* of the Covenant of Grace, and *our not knowing who are in it*, doth exclude Infants, it doth also exclude adult Professors from admission into the Church; for the signs of their being *savingly* in the Covenant of Grace, are but conjectural, hopeful, and probable, not certain and infallible: none can be sure, that he that makes profession at a full age, which qualifies him for Baptism, is not an Hypocrite at this minute, and will not be an Apostate the next; nor can we know that they are in the Covenant, for then we should know they are elected, whereas this is a *secret known only to God, 2 Tim.* 2. 19 *Deut.* 29.19. And the little ones of the Church, though they make no personal

*Examinat. Cap.* 8. §. 1.

personal profession, as adult persons do, yet are as visibly within the Covenant of Grace (parents having as much authority and reason to covenant for their children now, as *Deut.*29.10. with 30.6.) and as charitably to be accounted of, seeing of adult Christians the *weakest* can hold forth no more then the *least degree* of absolute probability, and the *strongest* no more then the *highest degree* of probability.

§.2. *Peter* saith, *Act.*2.38,39. *The promise is to you and to your children*: Concerning which observe, 1. That hereby is not meant *Christ is exhibited* (as some gloss,) The promise *Is*, id est, *fulfilled*, Christ is come; for this they had heard before, *vers.*36. and knew to their trouble, and therefore *were pricked in their hearts*: and these words are not any where in Scripture so taken; nor is Baptism a seal barely to Christ being come in the flesh, but to the benefits thereof covenanted and promised; nor is it a promise of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, but *the promise* κατ' ἐξοχην, Gospel promise of *remission of sin*, *Heb.*8.10,12. signed and sealed in Baptism, *Act.*3.19. which belongs to Gods people at all times, might heal *their being pricked in their heart*, *vers.*37. and is fitly used as a motive to perswade them to *repent and be baptized*, and is a suitable answer to their question, *What shall we do to be saved?* 2. He saith not, *The promise is to you, and to as many as God shall call, whether of your children or strangers*; as he might have said, if he would have levelled the children of Christians and Pagans: but he saith, *The promise is to you and to your children, and to as many*; making their children a distinct party, as from those that then *were*, so from those that *after* should be called; the words holding out their right, are in the Indicative Mood, The promise *is* to you: the like is never said to Pagans, or to any out of the Church. 3. These words are the same in substance with the reason and ground of Circumcision, *Gen.*17.8,10,11. That Promise and Covenant was a Gospel Covenant, *In thy seed shal all the Nations of the Earth be blessed*; and was an *everlasting Covenant*, *made four hundred thirty years before the Law*, and to be fulfilled in a great part of it after the ceasing of *Moses* Pædagogy, and of Circumcision, *Gal.*3.15, 16,17. *Rom.*4.12,16,24. *Heb.*13.20. *Rev.*14.6. and the said everlasting Covenant was not only with *actual Beleevers*, but with the lineal seed of *Abraham*, even before they actually beleeved,

believed, till some open revolt did disable them, and with the Infant-seed of Proselytes or *Gentiles* converted to the faith. 4. His motion, that every one of them should be baptized, doth imply, they had *right* to Baptism, (for he doth not perswade them to be Usurpers of that, to which they had no right,) and he grounds his motion not only upon their bare *personal interest* in the Promise, but their *childrens joynt interest* with them (as in *Gen.* 17. God doth for Circumcision,) which latter could not rationally be urged as a motive to perswade *the Jews to be baptized*, and to embrace Christian Religion, if the joynt interest of their children with them were not (at least) fully as great in the Christian as in the Jewish Church. Now if a Jew had a child born *before* his Conversion to Christianity, that child was Sacramentally to be initiated; but if he had a child *after*, you say it was not, but was in the same condition with a *Pagans* child, *viz.* not to be admitted into the Church till it were called: And if so, then where is the benefit belonging to the children of Jews converted by virtue of their Christianity? If a Landlord should move his Tenants to give up his *old* Lease or Grant (which hath certain immunities and priviledges to him and his children) and to take a *new* one, in which his children should have no more priviledges then meer strangers; could he rationally perswade him to surrender the old Lease or Grant, and to take a new one, from the benefit that may accrue to the Tenant and his children by it? 5. Here seem to be three ranks and conditions of persons: 1. The Jews themselves, then present and adult: 2. Their children, the present issue, which already was, or should be born of their bodies, what ever they were, younger or elder, Infants not excluded: 3. Those that were *afar off*, not in *estate* (for the mystery of the calling of the *Gentiles* was not fully closed with by *Peter* till *Act.* 10. nor could the Jews yet bear that saying,) but those that were afar off in *time*: Τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν (we with *Piscator* may add ὄσον) is a different phrase from that used of the *Gentiles*, τοῖς μακρὰν, *Ephes.* 2. 13, 17. and fitly may denote the posterity of the Jews in after ages. 6. These Jews (it's likely) were *pricked in their hearts*, not only for their *crucifying of Christ*, but *their cursing their children* about two months since, *Matt.* 27. 25. which curse did include their very Infants then newly born, and others that should be born afterward; and therefore if *Peter* had not included Infants in this Promise, the plaister had

not been large enough for their sore. Lastly, The Jews were apt long after this to scruple lesser matters, *Acts* 21. 20. and can it be thought that they should not startle and be discontented to have both Circumcision and Baptism taken from their Infants? nor enquire whether this seclusion of their Infants was not a fruit of their cursing of them? or how it could be justified by the Old Testament (there being then no other written Word?) or by what warrant the Church-membership and Covenant-interest, which their children formerly had, was repealed and taken from them? By all which, seriously considered, it will appear, that the children of Believers are included within the Promise, and to be baptized. Besides, if Infants be not within the Covenant of Grace, then they are *strangers* from it, and consequently *without God*, and *without hope*, as *Pagans* children are; and if they dye (though in Infancy,) their Parents may *mourn over them as such that have no hope*, contrary to 1 *Thess.* 4. 13. yea, while they live, they may lament over their children, as such whom they have begotten and brought forth to the Devil, and not to God, in respect of their visible estate.

---

## Anabapt. Cat.

Q. *What is Circumcision?*

A. *It was an Obligation to keep the whole Law*, Gal. 5. 3. Rom. 2. 24. *and showed unto them, that it was their duty to circumcise their hearts*, Jer. 4. 4.

*Examinat. Cap. 9. §. 1.*

Circumcision in it self was but an Obligation to *the Law as a rule of Righteousness*, subservient to the Covenant of Grace (as Baptism also is, *Rom.* 6. 3.) not to the Law in *the rigor* of it, as it was a Covenant of Works; for *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob* were not so obliged, they were in the Covenant of Grace as well as we, and Circumcision was to *Abraham* (by your own confession) *a seal of the righteousness of Faith*. *Christ* did profit many hundreds and thousands that were circumcised in the time of the Law, he was the *Lamb slain from the beginning of the World*, and they were saved by Faith in him, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2, 3. *Heb.* 11. but when Christians were circumcised in the time of the Gospel, out of a perswasion of its necessity, and their

their justification by it, then it did bind them to keep the whole Law, and *Christ* in that case *did profit them nothing*; and this is all can be inferred from your Texts, as to this matter. As Circumcision did shew it was their duty to circumcise their hearts, so Baptism shews *it is our duty to wash our hearts, Jerem.* 4. 14. *Jam.* 4. 8. (between heart-circumcision and heart-washing is no great difference, if any.) And as there was a precept for the circumcision of the heart, so God promised his people, that he will *circumcise their hearts, and the hearts of their seed*; of which before *Chapt.* 7. Though Circumcision did shew forth (you say) a Duty on our part, as well as a Promise on Gods part, yet (you know) Infants were then circumcised, though they had no actual knowledg of either. What you can gather hence (if any thing) against Infant-Baptism, I expect to know.

ANABAPT. CAT.

Q. *Was not Circumcision also a seal of the righteousness of Faith?* Rom. 4. 11.

A. *Yes, to Abraham only; and if Abrahams believing children amongst the Gentiles should be baptized as he was circumcised, then it must not be till they have the righteousness of Faith as Abraham here had, at least they must have it in profession.*

The Text saith, *It was the seal of the righteousness of Faith, which Abraham had, being yet uncircumcised*; but it saith not, that *it was so to him only*: The Apostle brings it as an argument to prove the way of *our* Justification to be by Faith alone, which were a meer inconsequence, if proper to him, and not belonging to others. There was adult persons Believers in *Abrahams* Family when Circumcision was first instituted, and many believing Proselytes afterward, which had Faith while yet they were uncircumcised, as *Abraham* had, of whom their Circumcision also was a seal of the righteousness of the Faith they had before; yea, *Moses* makes it to all *a sign of the Covenant, Gen.* 17. which doubtless was the Covenant of Grace; or, to use *Pauls* dialect, *the righteousness that is by Faith, Rom.* 3. 22 30. & 10. 3, 6, &c. *cum Deut.* 30. 6, 10, 11, 12. *Phil.* 3. 9. this being the Tenor of that Covenant, *Believe in the Lord Jesus* §. 2.

*Christ, and thou shalt be saved, Acts* 16.31. Your passage, implying, that there are some *believing children of Abraham* which have not the righteousness of Faith as *Abraham* here had, I do not understand, except you make *actual believing* and *having the righteousness of faith* two things, not only *distinct*, but *separable*: But whatsoever your meaning be, I cannot see here any shew of proof, that children must necessarily believe, or make profession of faith, before they may be baptized, as *Abraham* did before he was circumcised. *Abraham* could not be circumcised in Infancy, nor before Circumcision was instituted, no wonder therefore if he believed before; had Circumcision been instituted in the days of his fathers, *Abraham* might have been circumcised before he actually believed, as well as *Isaac* his son was. *Christ* could not be baptized till *John* did baptize, which was about the thirtieth year of Christs age, nor did he receive the Eucharist till the night before he suffered; yet some that pretend to imitate him, can be baptized, and possibly preach too, at 15, 16, 20, 21, &c. years of age, though Christ was neither baptized, nor did preach, till he was thirty.

ANABAPT. CAT.

Q. *Whether doth Baptism succeed Circumcision in the same Office?*

A. *No: Circumcision was to every Male (though reprobate) but Baptism only to the Believer*, Matt. 28. 19. *There being a change of the visible Church, and of the Ordinances, this cannot succeed in the room thereof, nor hath any dependance thereon.*

§. 3. Your Argument against the succession of Baptism to Circumcision is weak, *viz. Baptism is not like Circumcision in some things*, therefore *it is not like in any thing*, therefore it succeeds not in the same office: By this you may prove as well, That *the Supper doth not succeed the Passover*, nor *the Lords-Day the* Jewish *Sabbath*. The office of Circumcision was to *shew original sin, to teach necessity of Regeneration, of Mortification, of Salvation by Christ, the seed of* Abraham; *to sign and seal the Covenant, or the Righteousness that is by Faith, to distinguish Jews from others, to initiate solemnly and formally into the Church*: And doth not Baptism also initiate into the Church? 1 *Cor.* 12.13. Yea, doth

doth it not (Circumcision being now abrogated) perform the foresaid Offices? Indeed it is not every way the *same*, for then it were not *a successor*. Add hereunto, that the *Covenant* was the ground of *Circumcision*, *Genes.* 17. 7, 9, 10, 11. the *equity* whereof obligeth to Baptism, as the *equity* of the fourth Commandment extends to our Lords-Day. As for the *positive command*, vers. 12. it only determines *the time and day*, which circumstance of day and time was not built upon the Covenant of Grace (as Circumcision it self was) and therefore is not perpetual; and without such a positive determination of the time, Circumcision should and might have been administred to Infants: the Jews did circumcise children bought with their mony the same day they bought them, though they bought them the same day they were born: See *Ainsw.* in *Genes.* 17. 12. Oft-times Circumcision was not administred the eighth day, but deferred; in which cases the command of circumcising the eighth day was not observed; yet Circumcision was, and according to right reason ought, to be administred to Infants by virtue of the naked institution thereof, as we contend that Baptism ought now to be, both of them being (as was said) seals of the Covenant. But you, in saying *Circumcision was to every Male, though reprobate*, do imply, that *it was not to Females*; true: but both Males and Females were then baptized, and so they were in the New Testament, *Acts* 8. 11. *Gal.* 3. 28, 29. which is a sufficient justification of our deserting Circumcision in that point: And the Infant-females (as well as the adult) were counted members of the Jewish Church; and though, by reason of their incapacity, or Gods respect to the modesty of that Sex, they were not personally circumcised, yet they were circumcised in the Males: Hence the whole Church of the *Jews*, consisting of Females as well as Males, were called the *Circumcision*, in opposition of the *Gentiles*, which were called *Uncircumcision*, *Gal.* 2. 7, 8, 9. Again, It was not *administred to reprobates* as such, not to every Male, but to the *Males of the Church* externally in Covenant, some whereof possibly were Reprobates: So *Simon Magus*, *Judas*, *Ananias* and *Sapphirah* were baptized, and yet it is (at least) likely that they were Reprobates. Circumcision did belong to the Believer as well as Baptism doth; those that were strangers to the Jewish Church could not be admitted, but they must be *Proselytes*, not *of the gate* only, but of *righteousness*; they *must disclaim Paganism*,

*and profest the Jewish Religion*: A stranger continuing in his unbelief, was not circumcised, nor did partake in the Passover, *Exod.* 12. 48. And by proportion that Text prohibiteth all such Jews as should forsake the faith: See before *Chap.* 7. As for the change of the Church and Ordinances notwithstanding it, the Lords-Day may succeed the Jewish Sabbath, and those same persons which were bound to keep the Jewish Sabbath, are tied to observe the Lords-Day, *viz. servants and children*, as well as *Parents and Masters*, though the persons be not so distinctly set down in the New Testament as in the Old. *Paul* did use arguments from Analogy, from the *purging out of the old leaven at the Passover* to the *casting out of the incestuous from the Supper*, 1 *Cor.* 5. from the *maintenance of the Priests* to the *maintenance of Ministers*, 1 *Cor.* 9. 13. To argue *à genere ad speciem affirmativè*, is not good reasoning; The Church was changed, therefore it was changed in this particular: The Church might be changed, and yet not in this; the Sacrament may be changed, and not the subject: what belonged to the Jewish *Church* as a *Church*, belongs to the Christian Church also; that which belonged to it as *Jewish*, was altered, as High-Priest, Temple, Sacrifices, Ceremonies, &c. Infants Church-membership did not belong to the Church as *Jewish*, nor was it a Ceremony or Type; if you think it was, shew what it was a *type* of, and what was the *antitype* that hath succeeded it, and prove it so if you can. There was a Church, before there was an High-Priest, Temple, &c. in the Families of *Adam*, *Noah* and *Sem*, which was alive in the time of *Isaac*: *Melchizedek* surely had subjects and people, which were the Church (as well as he was a King and a Priest) of the most high God; This Church might continue long, & not be united to the Church in *Abrahams* family for ought we know: whatsoever the extent of the Church was, Domestical, Congregational, or National, Infants are reckoned of the same Church with their Parents: the Church *before* Christ, and *after* Christ, is the same Church; as an Heir, *while in nonage*, and *when adult*, is the same person. The Jews that believed were never unchurched; the Tree was not broken down, but *some branches broken off*: some additionals to the Church ceased, the Church it self ceased not; the *partition Wall was broken down*, and *Jews* and *Gentiles* made *one* Church, *Eph.* 2. 14. & 3. 6. And when

the

the wall was down, were their Infants turned out of the Church at one door, as the Gentiles came in at another? was the Church so changed, that it lost so many materials? and was the Covenant of Grace changed too? did it lose so many out of it? Visible Professors and their Infants are alike in every age, and there is nothing in them inconsistent with propriety in God, or interest in the Covenant, or the Seal thereof, in one age more then in another: Baptism is the seal of the Covenant now, and may be administred to visible Professors, and their children, now, as Circumcision was then; if there should be any difference, Reason would tell us, considering the painfulness and peril of Circumcision, *Gen.* 34. 25. and the easiness of Baptism, That only *grown men* should have been circumcised, and *Infants* baptized, rather then contrary.

---

## Anabapt. Cat.

Q. *Whether may not Infants of Believers be baptized by virtue of Covenant-holiness?*

A. *No: for Baptism is not a sign or seal of any such outward holiness, which may befall Reprobates as well as Elect; but it is a sign of Death, Burial, and Resurrection, which the Believer hath with Christ.* 2. *There is no command for baptizing such, if the Gentiles were so holy.*

BAptism *is a sign and seal of Christs Death, Burial, and Resurrection,* and of the truth and faithfulness of those *exceeding great and precious Promises* bundled up in the Covenant of Grace, which are *in Christ Yea and Amen,* 2 *Cor.* 1. 20. but it is not an absolute sign or seal of the baptized's *Death, Burial, Resurrection with Christ,* of *his putting on of Christ,* of *grace already wrought* in him, as you assert in your Answer to the second and third question, but only *conditional, Acts* 16. 30, 31. if he believe, as the *Romans* did, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. with 5. 1, 2. A Christian gathers the assurance of his Justification and Salvation by this or such a like Syllogism, *He that believeth, is justified, and shall be saved: I believe,* therefore *I am justified, and shall be saved.* The Major, or former Proposition, Baptism doth absolutely and universally seal; but not to the Minor, or second Propo- *Examinat. Cap.* 10. §. 1.

Propoſition, *viz. I believe*: If Baptiſm ſhould ſeal to all baptized ones, as ſuppoſe *Simon Magus, Judas, &c.* the truth of their Faith and their ſaving intereſt in *Jeſus Chriſt*, then ſhould God ſet his Seal (for Baptiſm is *Gods Seal*, not *the Churches*) to a lye and falſhood, or at leaſt command Miniſters ſo to do, when they are bound by the Rules of *Chriſt* to baptize ſuch as are not inwardly holy, as *Simon Magus, &c.*

§. 2. Children of Believers, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. are ſaid to be *Saints*, or *holy*; whereby is not meant, that they were *legitimate* only (for ſo had they been if both the Parents had been Infidels, and children are not *holy* becauſe they are not *baſtards*,) nor only *ſanctified to the uſe of the Parents*, as the unbelieving yoke-fellow (though not holy *in ſe*, nor ſanctifying) is *ſanctified to the believing yoke-fellow*, (the Holy Ghoſt neither here nor elſewhere ſpeaking of any thing to be ſanctified to unbelievers,) but they are *holy*, a diſtinct phraſe from being *ſanctified to another*, as birds and beaſts may be, and this holineſs proceeds from the believing yoke-fellow, which is the reaſon why he ſaith, *your* children, *viz. the children of you Chriſtian yoke-fellows* (the Infidel yoke-fellows writ not to *Paul*) are *holy*, which ſeeing it cannot be meant of *internal* and ſaving holineſs (for all children of the Church are not ſuch, though we are bound to judg the beſt till the contrary appear,) it muſt needs therefore be meant of outward federal holineſs, which is the privledg of the children of believing Parents above the children of Pagans, the Jews having had the like priviledg before; (See *Gal.* 2. 15. which I conceive runs parallel with this:) Or if but one of the Parents be Chriſtian, *partus ſequitur meliorem partem*, the children are not *Infidels*, but *Chriſtian*.

§. 3. But, ſay you, *there is no command for baptizing ſuch*, and you call it *Will-worſhip* forbidden, *Lev.* 10. 1. *A tradition and groundwork for more traditions*; others call it *the mark of the beaſt, one of the ſtrongeſt holds of Antichriſt*, and what not? To all which I anſwer, 1. If *Nadab and Abihu's offering ſtrange fire*, fire unſanctified, or not taken off the Altar, *was Will-worſhip* (though the Scripture doth not call it ſo,) yet Pædobaptiſm (ſuppoſe it be not warranted by the Word) cannot be will-worſhip, becauſe it is not an introduction of a new Worſhip or Ordinance, but the miſapplication of an old and unqueſtionable Ordinance of God, or (if you put on it the worſt name you can with any ſhew of reaſon)

*the*

*the Profanation of an Ordinance*, as your ſelf call it; ſome of your party, which have in deriſion and contempt of Infant-Baptiſm baptized Horſes, Cats, or Dogs, have been unqueſtionably guilty of horrible Profanation, but not of will-worſhip. 2. Infant-Baptiſm is grounded on, and warranted by the Word of God, and therefore is far enough from being a Profanation, or ſo much as the miſapplication of an Ordinance: That it is ſo grounded and warranted, needs no other proof then what hath already been produced in this Examination, upon occaſion of the Scriptures and Reaſons brought againſt it.

1. *They that are Diſciples in Scripture-ſence, are expreſſed in Chriſts Commiſſion about Baptiſm*, and *are to be baptized*. But *Infants of the Church are Diſciples in Scripture-ſence*: Therefore *they are to be baptized*. See Chap. 2. Sect. 3.
2. *They that are Abrahams ſeed are to be baptized*, as you confeſs: But *ſuch Infants are the ſeed of Abraham*: Therefore *they are to be baptized*. See Chap. 7.
3. *They that are viſibly within the Covenant of Grace are to be baptized*, (as you acknowledg:) But *ſuch Infants are viſibly within the Covenant of Grace*: Therefore *they are to be baptized*. See Chap. 8.
4. *They that are to be judged Church-members are to be baptized*: But *ſuch Infants of the Church, or born of members of the Church, are to be judged Church-members*: Therefore, &c.
5. *They of whom the Kingdom of God is, are to partake of the privileges of the Kingdom of God*: But *of Infants is the Kingdom of God*: Therefore, &c.
6. *They that are Saints, and holy, are to be baptized*: But *ſuch Infants are Saints, and holy*: Therefore.
7. *Chriſt* knew that Baptiſm was an ancient Ceremony of initiation into the Church, and applyed to the Infants of the Church as well as to adult Proſelytes; yet he took up that Ceremony, and advanced it (as he did the *Poſtcœnium* of the Paſſover) to be a Sacrament of the New Teſtament, without prohibition of Infants from it; and therefore he did at leaſt approve, it ſhould be adminiſtred to Infants. See *Cap.* 2. § 1.

In theſe alone (to omit others,) conſcientious enquirers into the

mind of the Lord Jesus may find satisfactory grounds of Infant-Baptism, especially when they are compared with the grounds of the contrary Opinion and Practice.

§. 4. You cannot shew any precept at all, or president, or good warrant, in the Word of God, that children of believing Parents should be kept from Baptism (as you require them to be) till they do in their own persons actually believe, or make profession of Faith; or that any such were baptized in riper years (as you would have them now to be:) Yea I further say, that if you can shew me in Scripture any son or daughter of believing Parents baptized, I shall shew you that he or she was baptized in Infancy: Surely from the time that *John Baptist* began his Ministry, to the writing of the *Apocalyps*, great multitudes of Infants of Christians grew up to maturity, yet amongst them all we read not of one whose Baptism was so delayed; nor have we any solid ground to conceive, that God at the coming of Christ took away Infants Covenant interest, Church-membership, and Sacramental initiation, and made their condition (as to this) as bad as the Heathen, and worse then the Jewish children, seeing it cannot be said, that God did take these priviledges away *in judgment*, upon occasion of Christs coming, from all Infants, even Elect children of Elect Parents, seeing Infants in the time of the Gospel are not any way more guilty, or uncapable, then in former times: nor can it any way appear, that God did it *in mercy*, (and sure if it was done, it was done either *in judgment* or *mercy*,) for it was a mercy to the Jewish children to have these priviledges, and nothing more was conferred upon Infants which lost them, then upon adult Christians which did not lose them. You cannot shew a precept or president for your gathering Churches out of other true Christian Churches; for requiring persons, before they can be admitted members, to give account of the truth of their graces; for the Congregations judging whether they have grace or no, and consequently whether they were to be admitted or no; for a solemn explicite Church-Covenant, for the erection of a Church without Officers; for the power of such a Church, consisting only of unofficed Christians, to elect, ordain, impose hands by one or more of them on their Officers, to censure or excommunicate any member, yea any or all their Officers when they have them;

for

for maintenance of Ministers by Lords-Day-Collections, formerly urged as an Ordinance of God, though of late much waved; for a sentence of non-communion with Sister-Churches; for Synods only consultative, and not decretive; for publike ordinary preaching of gifted men, not so much as intending the Ministry, and their receiving maintenance for their pains; and yet these are asserted by men of the Congregational way (in which *Antipadobaptists* are generally found) to be duties, priviledges of the Church, or Ordinances of God: nor can you shew any Church consisting of unbaptized ones (such as you account your selves to be (your Infant-Baptism being a nullity) till you be baptized upon profession) and such a Church admitting members, commissionating some Disciples to preach and dip: nor any precept or president for admission of such, which are (in your opinion) unbaptized, to the Lords Supper, not for rebaptizing such as were *baptized* (suppose in Infancy) *in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, or for renouncing such Baptism: nor can you shew any one Text of Scripture in which Infant-Baptism either in expres words, or in the interpretation of any Apostolick or Primitive Church or Father in the purest Times: nor can your shew one visible Church, from the beginning of the World, to the time when your Opinion was lately broached, which was of any long continuance, and did neither admit into it, nor permit in it, any Infant-member.

§. 5. Finally, Should you or I be required a *Command* for admission of women to the Supper (as you require a *Command for Infant-Baptism*, though you can neither shew command, nor example, nor good warrant for your contrary opinions and practices,) what clearer command can we shew for that, then for Infant-Baptism? Women were not admitted to both the Sacraments of the Old Testament: Christ did not admit women, no not his own Mother, to the Supper: There is expres uncontroverted mention in the New Testament of women being baptized, but not so of women communicating. If you alledg, that ὁ ἄνθρωπος (a name common to women, as well as men) ought to communicate, 1 *Cor.* 11.28. it is easily evaded, by saying, that the Apostle confines it to the Male by ἑαυτὸν and ὁ, *v.* 28, 29. and the same word is used of Circumcision, of which the Male only was capable, *Joh.* 7. 22. General terms of Disciples, Church-members, persons in Covenant, will carry it for Infants Baptism, as well as womens communicating!

If you alledg, That such and such Assemblies, in which there were women, did break bread, you know it may be, yea it is doubted by some sober spirits, whether that breaking of bread was Sacramental or no; and it may be said, that the company is said to do it because the Males did it; as the whole house of *Israel* is said to be circumcised, and called *Circumcision*, though the Females thereof were not circumcised. If you should tell us of housholds admired to the Supper (though I know not any such instance in Scripture) I might as well say, there was no women there, or they were excluded, as you say, there was no Infants in such or such an household, or if there were, they were excluded. Lastly, If men should bend their strength that way, they might as plausibly except against your admission of women (usually the forwardest part of your Societies) to the Supper, as you do, or (I believe) can do against Pædobaptism. Oh that our good God would in mercy to this distracted Church, and to the deluded Souls therein, remove prejudice out of our hearts.

---

ANABAPT. CAT.

Q. *Whether do you think Baptism administred in Infancy to be a lawful Baptism, and sufficient?*

A. *To me it is not; for I think it to be a Profanation of an Ordinance, for these Reasons:* 1. *Because it is taught by the precepts of men,* Isai. 29. 13. *not by God,* Jerem. 7. 22, 23.

*Exam. Chap.* 11. YOu hold, it seems, that *it is neither lawful nor sufficient,* and (in plain English) it is *null,* voyd, no Baptism at all: But consider (I pray you) could you prove the nullity of Infant-Baptism (as you have a great mind to do) what sad consequences would ensue: 1. That the people of God, for the space of 1600 years using Pædobaptism, were destitute of *one,* if not (by consequence) of *both* the Sacraments. 2. That the Churches in *England, Scotland, France, Denmark, Sweden, Germany, Geneva, Holland, New-England, &c.* which have usually no other Baptism but Child-Baptism, are no Churches, the members thereof being not so much as Christians outwardly, nor Sacramentally initiated into the Church; in doing whereof you dishonor God, and do Satan

tan great ſervice, Gods work being to *diſciple and enchurch the Nations of the World, Matt.* 28.19. *Mark* 16.16. 2 *Cor.*5.19. and *Satan's* to *undiſciple and Heathenize the Church*, either in reality, or in reputation, for the advancement of his own Kingdom. 3. That theſe, and all others, muſt for ever (as the caſe ſtands) want the Sacrament of Baptiſm, except a ſpecial and particular warrant come from Heaven (as to *John Baptiſt*) for the ſetting up of this Ordinance; for no man, who is both unſeparated to the work of the Miniſtry, and unbaptized (his Pædobaptiſm being a nullity) and ununited to the Church of Chriſt, can warrantably baptize himſelf, or any other, any more then *Saul* might ſacrifice, *Uzzah* ſtay the Ark, *Uzziah* offer Incenſe; a Midwife, *Turk*, *Jew* or *Pagan* adminiſter the Sacraments of Chriſts Church: for if Pædobaptiſm be a nullity becauſe of default in the ſubject, this alſo will be a nullity for want of commiſſion; for you can ſhew neither precept, preſident, nor good warrant for the Word, for any man that is unbaptized (having no ſpecial Commiſſion from God) to baptize himſelf, or to baptize any other; or for any man to accept of Baptiſm from ſuch an one, which is indeed no Baptiſm at all. *John*, as he had commiſſion from God for his baptizing; ſo he affirms, that *a man can receive nothing* (*viz.* no authority to baptize as he did) *except it be given him from Heaven, John* 3. 26, 27. as if he would profeſſedly caution the Church againſt ſuch courſes. 4. That the Societies of the *Independents* and *Separatiſts* (notwithſtanding their ſeparation from us) do yet (except they alſo turn *Anabaptiſts*) live within one of *the ſtrongeſt holds of Antichriſt*, are guilty of *obſerving traditions* and *precepts of men*, of *will-worſhip*, of *profanation of Gods holy Ordinance*, of *filling the Church with rotten members*, of *confounding the Church and the World together*; yea (ſay ſome of you) they *have the mark of the Beaſt* in their foreheads, and by conſequence are in the high way to eternal damnation: And what worſe can you ſay of any? Your Texts prove, that God hates hypocriſie, and over much regard of the commandments of men, and that God did command Obedience rather then Sacrifice, as 1 *Sam.* 15. 22. (for God did command Sacrifices and Offerings, *Levit.* chap. 1. 2, 3. &c.) What is this to Pædobaptiſm? Will you acknowledg that God hath commanded it to us, as he did burnt-offerings and ſacrifices to the Jews? we our ſelves ſay no more for it: But if

your Texts do forbid all humane inventions in the Worship of God. Pædobaptism is yet safe enough; for it hath been proved in the foregoing Chapter to have as good warrant from the Word, as some other (by your self acknowledged) Ordinances of God have, and better then your oppolite Opinion and Practices.

---

ANABAPT. CAT. M.

*A. Pedobaptism is done in a wrong manner, by sprinkling instead of Dipping.*

*Examinat. Chap. 12.*

THis exception you begin your Catechism with, telling us, that *Baptism signifies Dipping; By Dipping is never signified Sprinkling:* whence you would infer, That *Baptism should be by Dipping* only, and that *it is done in a wrong manner when it is done by Sprinkling*; wherein you much mistake: For, 1. Should the original signification of other Scriptures words be so much squeezed, then because the holy Communion is call'd a *Supper*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 20. (the word signifying a whole meal;) and the word ψαλλω, 1 *Cor.* 14. *Ephes.* 5. signifies not simply to *sing*, but to *sing to a musical Instrument*, and the original words for the gesture at the Supper signifie *lying* or *leaning on a bed*; you might with as good reason collect, *That the holy Communion should be a whole meal*, That *there should be instrumental musick in Churches* as well as vocal, That *men ought to lie or lean on beds* at the receiving of the Supper, or *else the Ordinances are done in a wrong manner*. 2. The word *Baptism* by your own confession doth signifie *washing* as well as *dipping*, and washing is the main thing, being the *end*, and dipping but the *means*, especially with reference to this Ordinance, which is for *washing, or putting away the filth of the flesh*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. *Acts* 22. 16. *Hebr.* 10. 22. 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. Now a thing may be washed, not only by Dipping, but by Sprinkling, or by affusion or puting water upon it, which is mostly used by us, and not Sprinkling. 3. The Greek word *Baptism* in Scripture signifies not only washing by dipping or plunging into the water, but by sprinkling or affusion. The *Baptisms*, or washings, mentioned *Hebr.* 9. 10. were (at least some of them) done onely by

*sprinkling*

*ſprinkling of water*, *Numb.* 8. 7. which was called the *water of ſeparation*, *Numb.* 19. 9. and *holy water*, *Numb.* 5. 17. or by *ſprinkling of blood*, which himſelf inſtanceth in, *Heb.* 9. 13, 19, 21. See alſo *Exod.* 29. 16, 21. *Pſal.* 51. 7. Their waſhings (called *baptizings*) of hands, were frequently (at leaſt) by letting water fall on their hands from a Laver, 2 *King.* 3. 11. So their Tables and Beds were not dipped into the water, but waſhing with pouring water on them, *Mark* 9. They that were *baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, and with fire*, were not dipped or plunged into the fire, (though, if they had, it ſeems it would not have burned them,) but *cloven tongues, as of fire, ſat upon each of them*, *Acts* 2. 3. with *Matt.* 3. 11. They that were *baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1. were not dipped or plunged into the Cloud or Sea, for it was dry Land; but probably they were bedewed, beſprinkled, or dropped on. The word βεβάμμενον, *baptized*, (by the Tranſlation rendered *dipt*) *Revel.* 19. 13. is no other in *Iſai.* 63. 2, 3. then *beſprinkled*. 4. Baptiſm ſignifies *Juſtification by the blood* of Chriſt, which is called the *Blood of Sprinkling*, *Hebr.* 12. 24. 1 *Pet.* 1. 2. *Hebr.* 10. 22. and *Sanctification by the Spirit* of Chriſt, which is called *ſprinkling of clean water on them*, *Ezek.* 36. 25. *Iſai.* 52. 15. both which were alſo typified by the aforeſaid legal purifications or waſhings. 5. It cannot be proved by the Word, nor is it probable in it ſelf, that the three thouſand baptized in *Jeruſalem*, *Acts* 2. 41. were carryed to a River, and there dipped one by one by the Apoſtles; or that *Paul*, *Lydia*, the Jaylor, and all theirs, which (it's likely) were baptized in houſes, were ſo dipped. Did they ſhift their clothes, or continued they in their wet apparel? and how could their whole body be waſhed (though it might be wet) with their clothes on? or were they all (men and women) baptized ſtark naked? and was not this contrary to modeſty, and a temptation which maſtered holy *David*? 2 *Sam.* 11. 1. Much leſs can it be proved, that be the perſon never ſo ſickly, the ſeaſon never ſo cold, yet dipping is (though it may endanger mens lives) not only lawful in it ſelf, (as we account it, yea it hath been commended above ſprinkling or affuſion,) but in all caſes and conditions neceſſary, and the omiſſion of it upon any occaſion is ſinful.

ANABAPT. CAP.

*Padobaptism is done by an Officer, where there is a questionable Power, as the Ministers ordained by Bishops deemed Antichristian.*

*Exam. Cap.* 13. THis exception is of no force against Child Baptism administred by such Ministers as are not ordained by Bishops. 2. You tell us not by whom, or whether *truly* or *falsly* the Bishops were deemed Antichristian: certes the old Nonconformists (how ever they or some of them might hold, that in the calling and authority of the Bishops there be divers things Antichristian,) agreed by joynt consent, *That they did not see* (I use their own words) *how our Bishops could be called Antichrists, or Antichristians: 1. Because the Word marks out Antichrist by his false doctrine; nor do we find in holy Scripture any such accounted Antichrist, or Antichristian, which holding the truth of Doctrine, swerveth either in judgment or practice from Christs rule for Discipline: now it is evident that our Bishops do hold and teach all fundamental Doctrines and Truths, and some of them have soundly maintained it against Hereticks, converted many to it, and have suffered persecution for the Gospel. 2. Their Hierarchy and other corruptions charged upon the calling of our Bishops, were rather to be esteemed the stairs and way to Antichristianity, then Antichristianity it self; for they were in the Church before the Pope, who is the Antichrist, and the chief Head-link of all Antichristianity, was revealed. 3. The Antichristian Bishops hold their preeminence as from Gods Law, which is unchangeable; whereas our Bishops, since her Majesties reign to this day (for the most part) hold their superiority by no other right then the positive Law, which is variable; yea it appears by the Institution of the Court of Delegates, and the continuance thereof to this day, that they do and ought by Law to hold their Jurisdiction, not as from God, but as from the Prince.* Thus they. And as to Ministers ordained by the Bishops, they say, *Bishops are able to judg of such gifts as are required for the sufficiency of Ministers, that many of them have been such Ministers themselves, as to whose labors the Lord hath set to his Seal——We are perswaded, that (though it were not necessary, yet) it cannot be unlawful for him that entreth into the Ministry to*

*be*

*be approved and authorized even by them. And if our Ordination be in this behalf faulty, how will our Brethren justifie the calling of their own Ministers, that have received Ordination ever from the people, who neither by commandment nor example can be found to have any such authority, nor are in any degree so capable of it, as the Bishops?* See Mr *Rathbands* grave Consutation, &c. *pag.* 19. and 38. 3. Suppose it were confessed, That the Bishops, as claiming by Gods Law sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction (if any so did) might in some qualified sence be called Antichristian; had this such an influence upon an Ordination, in which others joyned as well as he, so as to make it voyd and null, both as from himself, and from them? The Bishops were Presbyters, and so more enabled by Gods Word to ordain (as the godly Nonconformists truly assert) then any Non-Presbyters; and they came nearer to a *Presbytery* then two, three, or more members (which are nothing like a Presbytery, or company of Presbyters) can do: and their Ordination was judged valid, not only by the Parliament and the Assembly, but also by all the Reformed Churches abroad, as by the Nonconformists at home, notwithstanding they were opposers of, and were opposed by the Bishops; yea, God himself added his own Seal, affording not only Ministerial Gifts and Graces, but his gracious assistance, for Conversion of Souls, and edifying of the Saints; and (sometimes) so gloriously working by the Ministry of the Church of *England*, as he hath not (that we know of) wrought so by any other. But in your account the *Baptism administred* by such a Minister *is neither lawful nor sufficient*, or at least it is the *profanation of the Ordinance*: Who you are, I know not; but the general Opinion of your party is, that any *Disciple* (especially a *teaching Disciple*) *may baptize*: (See *Confession of the seven Churches*, Art. 41.) And doth Ordination by a Bishop, and other Ministers, make voyd such Discipleship, and make him that he cannot be so much as a private Christian, yea make his Baptism Antichristian? We receive from God the Old Testament by the hands of the Jews, and the whole Bible by the hands of Papists; most Scriptures have some time or other been abused, must we therefore disuse them? If a Bishop should baptize one at full age, making profession of faith and repentance, yea suppose a Jesuite, pretending to be a gifted Brother, or a teaching Disciple, (as it is lawful for the Jesuites to say or do any thing

that may tend to the weakening the true Reformed Religion,) and should dip many, would his dipping be null and voyd, and to be reiterated? This I dare say, Whatsoever is rational or religious, cannot be made irrational or irreligious, whosoever useth or hath used it; And if multitudes of persons should cast away all that they have received by the Bishops and Ministers ordained by them, they should with those things irrecoverably cast their Souls into Hell. When Antichrist most reigned and raged, and the woman fled into the Wilderness, God did preserve some Fundamental Doctrines, and the essence of Baptism, and the essence of a true Ministry dispensing it; and *they*, that is, her Pastors, *did feed her there*, *Revel.* 12. 6, 14. 4. There are now more Antichrists, then ever were before in our, or in any other Reformed Church; and worse Antichrists, by how much Fundamental Errors in Doctrine are greater abominations then Errors only in Discipline: All Heretiques in Scripture-language are Antichrists, 1 *Epist. John.* The Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies, Treacheries, Hypocrisies, Perjuries, Sacrilegious seditious Actions, Divisions and Subdivisions, bitter and bloody Contentions, Rebaptizations, Ordinations by the people, and other meer humane inventions of these Times, do justifie the Bishops, and all Episcopal men (that have kept themselves free from these and the like crimes) from being so Antichristian as we; do really dishonor the true Reformed Religion, delight the truly Antichristian Faction, and make way for our reducing, not only to Prelacy, but to that which all sober men count incomparably more dangerous, to Popery, yea to the worst edition of it, *Spanish*, Jesuited, Inquisition-Popery.

ANABAPT. CAT.

*Pædobaptism is done upon a wrong subject, who is not in Christs commission,* Matt. 28. 19. *nor* Mark 16. 16. *Believers and Repentants being the subjects therein.*

EXAMINAT.

You here beg the question; what you here alledg, hath been answered *Chap.* 1. and *Chap.* 2.

ANA-

*All the certainty I can have of such a Baptism, is only conjectural, not infallible; whereas the outward sign of a Sacrament must be visible and infallible, as the thing signified is; this Infant-Baptism I take only in trust from others.*

THE Infants blessed by *Christ* could in their riper age have no certainty of their being so blessed by him, nor had the Jewish Infants any certainty of their Circumcision; for the foreskin of circumcised Infants might be, and sometimes was, so drawn up, that when they came to age they could not discern their Circumcision. To this *Paul* alludes, 1 *Cor.* 7. 18. If the flesh-mark was alway discernable, yet it could not teach them whether a friend or foe had done it, whether for sacred or civil ends, whether duly or unduly, without instruction and information by word or writing; and such instruction may assure us of our right Baptism, though it was administred in Infancy. You may have such assurance of your Baptism, as the Priests by the *Registers* had of their pedigree, *Ezra* 2. 62. as *Paul* had, that he was circumcised the eighth day, that he was of the *stock of Israel, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, of the tribe of Benjamin, Phil.* 3. 5. Yea, you may have as much or more certainty that you were baptized, as that such an one was your father, such a woman your mother: yet sure (if you will call that only a conjectural and not infallible testimony) you will rest so much upon it, as to call him your father, and her your mother, that are testified and reputed to be so, and without scruple of conscience honor them, as you are bound by the fifth Commandment; and also keep that which is generally computed to be the first day of the week, or the Lords-Day, though you take it but on trust from others: Possibly he that is baptized at full age, may not infallibly know that he was baptized; some have forgotten (through sickness) the greatest concernments, yea their own names, must they thereupon be rebaptized? Possibly a man or woman, as you are dipping them under the water, may be so damped, that they may not hear, or not heed the words said by the Administrator, whether he baptize, or bless, or curse; must they be dipped again, till they do hear, and heed, that they may infallibly know themselves to be baptized? *Examinat. Chap.* 14.

If a man should herein be deceived, and think he was baptized in his Infancy, when he was not, the Error is not very dangerous; Faith in Christ may supply the defect of Baptism: and he not neglecting or contemning Baptism, nor knowing that he wants it, may reap benefit by his supposed Baptism, as if it were real.

As for his resolution of the case (grounded on the supposed unlawfulness of Pædobaptism,) *whether a Christian may with good conscience be present at it*, I judg it unnecessary for me to discuss it, (having (I hope) cleared the lawfulness of Infant-Baptism,) yet I confess, I cannot approve sundry things in it, though Pædobaptism were confessed to be unlawful.

SOME

# SOME OBSERVATIONS Both Old and New, Concerning the pretended Visibility, Universality, Antiquity, Infallibility, Unity and Purity of the present *Roman* Church and Religion.

## Sent to a Gentleman upon his Revolt to Popery; and now Published (with some few Additions) for the Churches good.

*SIR,*

1. YOu do all confess the affirmative and positive Doctrines of the Church of *England* and other Reformed Churches to be true and Catholique, and to have had visible Professors in all Ages; only you superadd certain other Doctrines, which (you say) are necessary to be beleeved unto Salvation:

For evidence whereof, observe,

| 1. Our Churches Doctrine, | 2. Your Churches Additions. |
|---|---|
| All the Books of the Old and New Testament, mentioned in the 39 Articles, and in the late Confession of Faith, to be holy and Canonical, are for such to be received. | *The Books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Maccabees, and the rest (commonly called Apocrypha) are also Canonical.* |
| The Scripture is the Rule of Faith and Manners. | *Traditions of the Church are of equal Authority with the Scriptures.* |

The Originals, Hebrew and Greek, are Authentical.

*The Vulgar Edition is most pure and Authentical.*

There are two Sacraments of the New Testament; Baptism, and the Lords Supper.

*There are also five more, viz. Confirmation, Pennance, Extream Unction, Orders (of which there are seven, viz. Priests, Deacons, Sub-deacons, Acolytes, Exorcists, Lectors or Readers, Ostiaries or Door-keepers) and Matrimony.*

God is to be invocated, and Religiously worshipped.

*Yea, and the Images of God also, Crosses, Crucifixes, Altars, Angels, Saints, with their Reliques and Images.*

Christ is the Head of the Church.

*And the Pope also.*

Christ is our Mediator and Advocate.

*So are the Angels and Saints likewise.*

Christ was conceived without original sin.

*And the Virgin Mary also.*

Christ was once sacrificed on the Cross for the Redemption of the world.

*Christ is dayly offered up in Mass a propitiatory Sacrifice for the sins of quick and dead.*

We are saved by the merits of Christ.

*And also by the merits of the Saints.*

We are justified by Faith.

*And by hope, love, fear of God, good works, which merit Salvation.*

All the words and actions which Scripture records to be used by Christ in the celebration of the Supper, are to be used by us also.

*The sacred Hoast must also be elevated, adored, reserved, carried in solemn procession.*

Christ is truly present in the Eucharist.

*Christ is corporally present by Transubstantiation, and may be received into the mouths of wicked men, yea of Rats and Mice.*

There are two places for the

*And two besides, viz. Purgatory*

Souls of such as depart hence.

The three Creeds, commonly called the Creed of the Apostles, of the *Nicene* Councel, and of *Athanasius*, are to be received and beleeved.

*tory and Limbus Infantum.*

*And Pope Pius his Creed also, or his additions to the Nicene Creed, are also to be received and beleeved.*

These and the like positive Points of the Reformed Religion (whereof I omit sundry) are truly and properly Catholique, for in them not only Papists, but in a manner all Christians in the world concur with us: but in your Additions you stand single, and have multitudes of Christians in the Eastern and Western Churches dissenting from you.

2. Peruse the Book of nine and thirty Articles, the Homilies, Leiturgy and Catechism, or the late Directory, Confession of Faith, or Catechisms, larger or shorter, and find if you can the Doctrine of our Church contrary to any one Article of those several Creeds which in the first six hundred years were Badges of Catholique Profession, or produce any one of those Articles to which we do not willingly subscribe.

3. Though the ancient Church did undoubtedly beleeve and profess all that was necessary to Salvation, yet there is not one Creed of General or National Council, particular Church or Father, within a thousand or twelve hundred years after Christ, in which the Articles of Pope *Pius* his Creed were imposed (as now they are) for Articles of Faith necessary to be beleeved unto Salvation.

4. The Church of God (as might be proved by Scriptures or Fathers, if it were not acknowledged by your own Authors) cannot make a new Article of Faith, nor any addition to the Creed, save by way of Explication of that which was formerly upon Scripture grounds beleeved and professed: But these additions of yours were not beleeved (if you should say that they were beleeved *implicitely*, this (suppose it true) would take away the Visibility of the Profession thereof) by the Ancient Catholique and Apostolique Church,

5. None of your side hitherto hath, or hereafter can produce any one visible Church, which in the Apostolique and in all succeeding Ages did approve and use Communion in one kind, Private Mass, Prayer in an unknown Tongue, Image-worship, Pardons,

Pardons, Indulgences, which believed the Popes Infallibility, his Superiority over General Councels, his temporal Authority over Kings and Emperors to depose them, and dispose of their Dominions, the necessity of auricular Confession, the determinate number of seven Sacraments, Purgatory, and the Popes Power to deliver Souls from thence, which forbade Lay-men (without a special dispensation) to read the Scriptures, or Priests to marry, &c.

6. Nay you cannot name any one person in each several Age, out of whose words or writings (notwithstanding there were sundry Creeds, Confessions of Faith, Catechisms, Sermons or Homilies, Summaries of Christian Doctrine) the aforesaid particular Points of Popery may be collected, descending from the age of *Christ* to the days of *Luther*.

7. Nay you cannot name any one Father or Catholique Writer for twelve hundred years after *Christ*, that did hold all those Tenets which are now taught by the *Romish* Church, and authorized by the *Trent* Councel.

8. None of your side hath or can prove, that any of the Primitive Martyrs or Confessors suffered Death, Banishment, Torment, Confiscation, &c. for the Popish Religion, or any particular thereof, in which they differ from the Church of *England*; as Papal Supremacy, Communion in one kind, Image-worship, &c.

9. You cannot shew, that any one Article of your Faith in which we dissent from you, is Catholique according to *Vincentius Lirinensis* his Rules, *viz.* which was Ancient in his time, and in respect of the *Arrian* Heresie, which he calls *novellum dogma, a novel tenet*; and that which you know, that not *unus aut duo tantum sed omnes*, &c. *not only one or two, but all, though living in several times and places, have with one consent openly, frequently, constantly held written and taught.*

10. None of your side dare for shame affirm, that Communion in both kinds, Prayer in a known Tongue, communion of Priest with people, Lay-mens reading of the Scriptures, Worship of God without Images, Invocation of God without mediation of Saints or Angels, and other the aforesaid affirmative and positive Doctrines, were invented by *Luther*, or that they are not in themselves so lawful and agreeable to the Scriptures, and

practise

practise of the first six centuries of years, as Communion in one kind, Prayer in an unknown Tongue, &c.

11. There are few or no Points denyed or affirmed against us by you, in which you vary not amongst your selves; and if any of you will distinctly set down (avoyding general and ambiguous terms) what he thinketh to be the truth in any Question or Exposition of Scripture controverted betwixt us, I verily beleeve I can name him another Papist, new or old, that saith the contrary: *Bellarmine* doth *obiter* discover to the world above three hundred several Opinions of Papists, and those only in and about the Points controverted between you and us; and *Navarre* mentions about sixty Dissentions of your Doctors in one only Point, to wit, Confession.

12. I shall hold, till herein I be convinced of Error by instance to the contrary, that whatsoever titles are by the ancient Fathers given to the Eucharist, whereby you would prove Transubstantiation, Adoration, Sacrifice, &c. the same phrases, or some equivalent to them, may be found in the Fathers concerning Baptism, in which you confess there is neither Transubstantiation nor Sacrifice.

13. Also, that those glorious things which were spoken by them of the Bishops of *Rome*, may be parallel'd by such as read them throughly with the like honorable mention of other Patriarchs and Bishops.

14. Also, that as good testimony may be produced out of the Fathers for the absolute necessity of the Eucharist, as for the absolute necessity of Baptism.

15. Also, that though *gemina* or *duo Sacramenta* be sometimes found, yet *septem Sacramenta*, or words equivalent to them, cannot be found in any ancient Father, though they did call by the name of Sacraments, not only Ordination, Matrimony, &c. but ablution of the feet, sign of the Cross, &c. which are not properly so called.

16. I desire to be satisfied why you so frequently and suspiciously (the matter being so mainly controverted) do in your allowed Manuals, Catechisms, &c. leave out of the Decalogue all the second Commandment, or that large passage prohibiting the worship of Images.

17. Also, how you can reconcile the two Bibles of *Sixtus* and

*Clement*, between which are so many and material differences; or if you cannot reconcile them, how you can satisfie your Conscience whether of them is Authentical, seeing they have equal Authority from the See Apostolique, equal Absolutions from Oaths of admitting any other, equal Imprecations and Curses to them which receive them not for Authentical; so that either you must use no Bible at all, or undergo the curse of Pope *Sixtus*, if you use that of *Clement*; or of Pope *Clement*, if you use the other of *Sixtus*.

18. For as much as Traditions are defined to be the Rule of Faith, and equal to the Scriptures, and nothing is more necessary for the Church to do then to deliver the Rule of Faith clearly and precisely; what is the cause I pray you, that no Pope or Councel, no not that of *Trent*, hath given an exact Catalogue or List of divine and infallible Traditions? is it because you are not fully as yet agreed of them, or are they for some politique ends reserved in the Popes Breast?

19. This Assertion [that *the Roman Church is infallible in all her Decrees and Definitions*] is the Foundation of your Faith, and if it fail, your Faith fails also; yet it is much doubted of, yea denyed by some Romanists; nor (as I suppose) was it ever declared, decreed or defined by the Church in any General Councel; if it was, I pray you shew me when, where, and in what terms.

20. Suppose this was so defined, and thereupon you be assured that the Church is infallible, yet you cannot be infallibly assured what is meant by the Church, which some of your Doctors interpret to be the Church *essential*, some the Church *representative*, (which, as some of them hold, is a General Councel, though without the Pope; others, the Councel and the Pope together,) some the Church *virtual*, the Pope alone; which yet are not agreed amongst themselves when, where, and in what matters the Pope may or may not err.

21. If herein you were resolved, yet you cannot be infallibly assured that the present Pope is a true and lawful Pope, seeing he may be promoted by Simony, or his Baptizer or Ordainer, or the Baptizers or Ordainers of them, or some of them, might miss the right intention of Baptizing or Ordaining, in which case he cannot be in the sight of God a lawful Pope.

22. Put

22. Put caſe you hope well of your Pope, yet it is poſſible you may miſtake Papal Decrees, Definitions, &c. and not underſtand them in their true and genuine ſence. *Soto* and *Catharinus*, who were preſent at the *Trent* Councel, could not agree what was the Councils meaning in the Points of Original Sin and Juſtification, but writ Books one againſt another of that Subject.

23. You will ſay perhaps, The Pope is a living Judg to determine theſe or the like doubts; which if it were granted, yet ſtill you have no ſuch infallible certainty as you pretend; for you never heard the Pope preach, propound Truths, or reſolve Doubts; you only hear his Prieſts and Jeſuits, whom I hope you will not exempt from a poſſibility of deceiving, or being deceived, eſpecially ſeeing both Prieſts and Jeſuits, Dominicans and Franciſcans, do pretend the Pope to be their Patron, and their Tenents, though contrary one to another, to be the Tenents of the Church.

24. Laſtly (to omit other Obſervations till further occaſion) If proof of the Churches Infallibility be demanded of you, you will alledg *Matth.*16.18. or *Luke* 22.32. or ſome other Scripture. If again you be demanded, what aſſurance you have that *Matth.*16.18: *Luk.*22.32. and the other Scriptures, are of divine Authority, and that they are not corrupted nor miſ interpreted? you muſt anſwer, That the Church is infallible, which keeps and interprets the Scripture. Thus you prove the Infallibility of the Church by the Scriptures, and the Infallibility of the Scriptures by the Church, which is nothing elſe but to run round in a circle to beg the Queſtion, and in effect to prove the Churches Infallibility by the Infallibility of the Church.

Imprimatur,

*March* 4. 1652.

*Edm: Calamy.*

---

*FINIS.*